THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 2. MAY, 1933. Vol. XXIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Dr. Edwyn Bevan's attack on Bishop Barnes.

To the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1933, Dr. Edwyn Bevan contributed an article entitled 'Bishop Barnes on Science and Superstition,' which opened with the following declaration :

> 'The purpose of this article is to urge that a certain kind of argument used against what is believed to be superstitious belief and practice in the Christian Church, the kind of argument used at the recent Congress of Modern Churches [*sic*] at Bristol by the Bishop of Birmingham, and analogous arguments which he has used on other occasions, are invalid, and therefore tend to throw thought about religion on to wrong lines, with unhappy results.'

This article, which must have carried more weight with those who are not intimately acquainted with the arguments of the Bishop of Birmingham than with those who are, has, we are glad to observe, been ably refuted by Professor de C. Richardson of Birmingham University in the April number of the *Hibbert Journal.*

It is impossible in this brief notice of the controversy to do justice to the dialecticians, but readers of the reply to Dr. Bevan will have no doubt that he has had the misfortune to misrepresent, because he has misunderstood, the Bishop's criticisms of current traditionalist teaching and superstitious practices in the English Church.

Professor Richardson maintains that the foundation of the fierce opposition to Dr. Barnes' criticism of popular ecclesiastical superstitions both in doctrine and practice rests on a refusal to recognize the intelligibility of the Universe and its essential

unity, and so to recognize that Reality cannot be self-contradictory. But to depart from generalities to particulars, it seems to be widely held in ecclesiastical circles, and in this case also by Dr. Edwyn Bevan, that Dr. Barnes maintains 'the preposterous notion' that if the bread and wine at Holy Communion be transubstantiated by the action of valid consecration this change can be tested by chemical analysis. This charge against the Bishop, Professor Richardson refutes by a series of quotations from his public utterances and published writings. It seems to us, in view of so general a misunderstanding on the part of the bishop's opponents, that these citations, though of course they repeat each other, should be given here *verbatim* and in full.

> 'The Reformers, unfortunately, had neither the methods nor the language of modern experimental religious psychology. We to-day say smoothly that, if the alleged spiritual change has taken place, there must be someone by whom it can be spiritually perceived. . . . All the Reformers were instinctively rejecting the theory that change occurs in a material object although such change cannot be perceived; all were instinctively asserting the fact of God's direct communication of Himself to the human soul.' (From an address on 'The Reformation and the Scientific Movement of To-day,' delivered at the Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen at Bristol and published in the *Modern Churchman,* August-October, 1932, p. 354.)
>
> 'If there were a *physical* change in the bread, chemical analysis would enable us to detect it. All are agreed that this type of change does not take place. Yet if there be a *spiritual* change, it must surely be possible for a man to recognize it by his spiritual perception' (p. 318).
>
> 'We can apply scientific tests* to inanimate matter and demonstrate that the spiritual properties supposed to be inherent in it have no existence apart from a knowledge of the rites and ceremonies to which it has been subjected.'
>
> *'These tests, of course, would be psychological, not physical or chemical. We must test "holy matter" by the reaction of a human being and not by a galvanometer or chemical reagent' (p. 267).
>
> (From the Bishop's book, *Should Such a Faith Offend?*)

Dr. Bevan's misrepresentation of the Bishop, so Professor Richardson maintains, is due to his too narrow conception of science, from the scope of which he excludes psychology. On the other hand, the Bishop, who is himself not only a Doctor of Science but also a Fellow of the Royal Society, regards science as the interpretation by the higher reason of all the data with which the sciences provide us, and explicitly includes psychology within this sphere. In this connection Professor Richardson writes that in his book, *Should Such a Faith Offend?*

'the Bishop gives ample material from which we can see what he means by Science. It is there made quite plain that he uses the term, of course with perfect accuracy, to include all kinds of sciences — psychology, anthropology and logic — much more often and much more relevantly than the purely physical sciences: and, indeed, in his more sweeping statements it is clear that he uses science not only for the *results* of scientific method, but for the scientific method itself. On pp. 145-6, the Bishop says: "Science has not merely created a new cosmogony against which, as a background, religion must be set. As the character of its postulates and the extent of its limitations have become more clear, science has given us a new conception of what we mean by reasonable faith . . . But there is more to be said. The indirect influence of scientific method, its patient induction, its readiness to admit divergent conceptual representations of observed facts, its absence of exaggeration, its hostility to evasive language and, above all, its abhorrence of argument which pretends to be free but is pledged to reach assigned conclusions — this influence has not yet made itself fully felt" [in the teaching of the Christian Church of to-day]. There is, he points out, much alienation of the modern world from some of our dogmatic teaching. "There is only one way in which accredited religious teachers can overcome it. They must use scientific method . . . In science we build upon the assumption that the processes of Nature can be represented by schemes that are, to us, rational. There is, we postulate, a unity between Nature's processes and the working of the human mind."'

Readers of the *Modern Churchman* will feel grateful to Professor Richardson for her able defence of her much-maligned Bishop, but we should be sorry that our very inadequate presentation of some of her points should deprive them of the pleasure and profit of reading the *Hibbert Journal* article for themselves.

Scientific Evolution and Romanism.

Galileo, when on his knees he recanted his statement that the earth moves round the sun, muttered beneath his breath, so the legend runs, 'but still it moves.' Had he applied the words not to this whirling planet, but to the Roman Church which forced him to recant, he would have been saying no less than the truth. The Roman Church does not move quickly, nor even visibly, nevertheless it does move, and its movement consists of a belated following in the steps of scientific research. Several centuries were required to elapse before it accepted the Copernican astronomy; it has only required about a couple of generations to allow it to accept biological evolution. The first Roman Catholic to declare his conviction of the truth of evolution in a published book bearing the *Nihil obstat* and *Imprimatur* was the Abbé Dordolot of Malines. A further stage in acceptance

has now been reached. A Roman Catholic professor in Priest's Orders, Dr. J. A. O'Brien, an American, has followed in the courageous footsteps of the Abbé, and in an able and persuasively written volume, entitled *Evolution and Religion*,* bearing the *Nihil obstat* and the *Imprimatur* of the local Roman authorities, accepts not only the scientific truth of evolution but argues for its apologetic value for the Christian faith. The jacket of the volume asserts that

> 'For the first time, a Catholic who accepts the hypothesis of evolution interprets the bearing of that viewpoint on the Christian faith. The author finds that the concept of evolution greatly strengthens the idea of purpose in the universe and reinforces the belief in a supreme intelligence.'

So at long last the scientific doctrine of evolution, which the church opposed on the ground that it denied the existence of, or even the need for, a Creator, and the Divine origin of man, by annihilating all evidence for design in creation, has been embraced as an important proof of Divine Purpose. Perhaps we may add that this argument for the apologetic value of the theory of evolution was presented by Frederick Temple, at that time Bishop of Exeter, in his Bampton Lectures in the year 1884.

The following citations from Professor O'Brien's book are of interest in view of the official character of the volume :

> 'According to St. Augustine, God did not interrupt the unbroken reign of natural law to create directly and immediately the beginnings of life, nor even the body of the first man, but created them in their causes or germinal powers (*rationes seminales*) and then caused them to be evolved in accordance with the operation of the laws of nature of which He is the ultimate author' (pp. 218-9).

> 'Indeed there are some who think that the immediate creation of the first form of life is a necessary postulate of theistic philosophy . . . this view-point really assumes that the Creator can manifest His power only through direct action, and not through the mediation of secondary causes . . . the utilization of secondary causes in the accomplishment of a purposed end, instead of veiling the glory and magnificence of the Divine Power, bestows upon the latter a splendour and a sublimity which is singularly lacking in the concept of numerous special interventions necessitated to achieve the Divine Will . . . In the demand for supernatural intervention there is too much crude anthropomorphism, too much of the reflection of the human way of operating, and too little mirroring of the Divine Omnipotence' (p. 221*f*).

It is well known that the Bishop of Hippo held the Traducian view of the origin of human souls, which claims that the first man contained within himself the seed of all the souls of

* *Evolution and Religion*, by John A. O'Brien, Ph.D. (The Century Co., London and New York; 1933. Price 10/6.)

the human race. This Traducian doctrine fits in aptly with biological evolution, but in Augustine's case it did not exclude, as it does with the scientific mind, the belief in Divine interventions. Augustine's belief in the historical character of, and the necessity for, the Virgin Birth is an example of this.

In dealing with the 'days' of Creation, Professor O'Brien writes:

> 'The word *yôm* ("day" as used in *Genesis*) has exactly the same meaning as the word *day* in common English . . . In the light of the above, the futility of reading into the words of the *Genesis* account to make it serve as a text-book of natural science, or even to pretend that it purports to describe in a scientific manner the various stages through which the earth has evolved from a nebulous mass, becomes clearly evident' (p. 232).
>
> '. . . All the available scientific evidence points to some form of evolution as the most plausible explanation of the various forms of life. None of it points to a series of special creations . . . by holding to special Divine interventions to account for each organic species, (one) does not escape from the embarrassment of portraying God as wilfully arranging the evidence of nature in such a way as to lead the naturalist into error . . . Intransigents who persist in the name of the Bible and of religion, in holding to a theory that does violence to all the findings of science, instead of advancing their sacred cause, damage it immensely by their misdirected zeal' (pp. 236-7).
>
> 'It is significant, too, that the Catholic Church, speaking through the Pope, did not officially condemn the new scientific theory (evolution). The keynote of the Church's policy was sounded by Pope Pius X when he declared: "Religion has no fear of science. Christianity does not tremble before discussion, but before ignorance"' (p. 119).

Yet as recently as 1908 Professor Salvatore Minocchi was excommunicated for teaching that the second and third chapters of *Genesis* were not historically accurate.

In dealing with the reconciliation of Science and Religion, Professor O'Brien records with pardonable enthusiasm the papal recognition of the scientific teaching of Professor St. George Mivart. He writes:

> 'In 1870, the distinguished biologist and Christian philosopher, St. George Mivart, rendered a notable contribution to the reconciliation that was gradually being effected, by publishing *The Genesis of Species*. In this work, he maintained that it is not "absolutely necessary to suppose that any action different in kind took place in the production of man's body, from that which took place in the production of the bodies of other animals, and of the whole material universe." A storm of criticism from the religious press both of the Old and the New World was showered upon the work, and its author was denounced by many Catholic theologians as a downright heretic. A flood of denunciation somewhat similar to that heaped upon Darwin after the appearance of his *Origin of Species* was now let loose upon Mivart, a profoundly religious man.

> 'Critics in England, France and Germany were especially vehement in their denunciation of the book as heretical and sought to have it placed upon the Index. Mivart himself forwarded his book to the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX. It was the almost universal opinion of the theologians of the time that the work would be condemned, and the author obliged to retract or modify his views. Imagine their surprise when, on the contrary, the Pontiff made Mivart a doctor of philosophy, and no less a personage that the Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Manning, conferred the degree upon him at a public ceremony' (pp. 112-3).

Professor O'Brien does not seem to be aware that Professor Mivart was excommunicated by Cardinal Vaughan on June 18, 1900, on account of two articles which were published in the *Nineteenth Century* and in the *Fortnightly Review*. Mivart died on April 15, in the same year, without having been reconciled to the Roman Church.

AN UNSENTIMENTAL CHRISTOLOGY

By the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare, M.A., Chaplain to H.M. the King.

SINCE Sterne wrote *The Sentimental Journey*, the word 'sentiment' and its derivatives have undergone some interesting changes of meaning. To write the history of these changes fully, one should need to take note of the use of 'sentiment' as a technical term in psychology. Psychology has no obvious right to impose its technicalities upon literature: but it has a perfect right to use words in any restricted sense convenient for its own purposes.

More important, however, than these changes is the significance which the words have now acquired. Sentimentality is a modern name for what is, in the main, a modern thing—for a frame of mind which has sufficient influence to be worth definition and analysis. In the mouths of the educated the words convey blame. If we speak of 'cheap' or 'false' sentiment—of the sentimentalist as 'wallowing' in his emotions—we are virtually distinguishing two possible attitudes towards our feelings.

Upon emotion, in the wide sense, all our moral and aesthetic judgments depend. We cannot perceive the incongruity of two colours unless we *feel* that they clash. Here reason and feeling are inseparably blended. Similarly, if we were devoid of in-

dignation and moral disgust, no cold reasoning could supply their place. But, in contrast with these cases, where we allow our emotions to guide us, and confidently accept their testimony, there are other cases where emotions are fostered without such conviction, simply because we enjoy them.

Thus we may define the sentimentalist as the man who allows himself to be misled by emotions which he excites for the purpose of pleasure. Sentimental tunes, pictures, melodrama, have a commercial value out of all just proportion to their merits. They rely upon the feelings easiest to arouse. But sentimentalism is not confined to its grossest examples. Perhaps no work of art which is fairly described as 'romanticist' is wholly free from the sentimental taint. Sentimentalism enters, too, even into morality and religion. Sentimental evangelism is not so common as people think; but where it exists it is dangerous. When the hearer—like the lover in *Phaedrus*—'gets sane,' he is ashamed of the feelings which he has indulged.[1] 'Morality,' says Senator Croce, 'is the only thing which can never be produced from the intention to play.'[2] Yet just as the sentimental historian distorts his facts for the pleasure of indulging his indignation, so the sentimental moralist or politician allows the play of sentiment to interfere even with his policy or his conduct.[3]

The strangest paradox of all is that sentimentalism should associate itself with the purest, and therefore in a sense the sternest, Figure in history. Yet this association is common. A man who served in the ranks during the War insisted that what his comrades most needed was to know Christ 'from the Gospels and not from the hymns or the pictures.' A pleasing sense of the companionship of a 'White Comrade' may last as long as danger lasts and no longer.

One cause, again, of the recent revolt against theological Liberalism is the impression that a Liberal Christianity often leaves men with nothing better than a sentimental hero-worship for its Founder—a pathetic wonder that the most amiable of teachers, the propounder of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, should have been harried to death by an ungrateful world.

[1] 241 A. [2] *Estetica*, p. 98. [3] *Cf.* the phrase *Gefühlspolitik*.

The instinct of the orthodox has been here in part correct. A sentimental Christology is a low Christology. There is no justification for the devotion which the Christian Church has in fact rendered to Jesus except in the conviction that He is *more* than a hero, that His claim is not a matter of sentiment but of obligation. Devotion to any less an object than the highest is a sort of play. To surrender ourselves to such devotion is treason to the highest itself.

It may be objected that the recent revolt against German Liberalism is itself sentimental : that here we have only one kind of German sentimentality in conflict with another. Quotations from Karl Barth might give excuse for this charge. Yet it is only fair to remember that the great antidote against all sentimentalism in general—the Kantian Ethic—is itself a German product, though the Kantian distinction between inclination and obligation merely makes explicit what was implicit in Christianity from the beginning.

It is not too much to say that to defend the worship of Christ from the charge of idolatry we must identify His claim upon us with the claim of the Moral Law upon our obedience.

We should use, after all, the same language about God. A Creator, however self-existent and eternal He might be, whose moral temper was that of Jupiter, would have no claim upon our worship or obedience. Since moral obligation is the sole and all-inclusive obligation, it is only so far as homage to God can be identified with homage to duty—to the law of holiness—that the absolute surrender of our wills to God is right. Is Jesus, then, such that His call to us demands from us the same response —absolute obedience—as is demanded by the Moral Law? Is He such that we ought to react to *His* influence with the same complete submission which we owe to *its* command?

The worship of a historical personage by civilized and monotheistic mankind is so startling a fact that theology should welcome every challenge to defend this worship on its merits : and especially every attempt to isolate the moral claims of Jesus to this worship and to distinguish them from every non-moral claim that might be alleged on His behalf. If we have once seen that mere eternity or power is not in itself an adequate claim to worship, it is surely sheer confusion of thought which shrinks from

saying that His claims to our worship, if we admit them at all, must be purely moral. It is unfortunate that the revolt against Liberalism should have begun before the best lesson of Liberalism has been fully learnt from Kant and Ritschl — the distinction between judgments of fact and judgments of value and the supreme importance of the latter. Though for the theist the questions of His origin and of His character must ever be closely connected, it ought to be clear that what He *was* is more relevant to His claim upon our worship than whence He *came*.

Now the recent discussion on the doctrine of the Kenosis — left at present in a somewhat inconclusive state — forces us to isolate this question of His moral claim. The present position may be briefly summed up. Are we to say that, during such an episode as the Agony in the Garden, He was aware of the 'glory which He had with the Father before the world was'?[4]; that during His ministry He remembered the experiences involved in being the Father's living instrument in Creation? Orthodoxy has been inclined to say 'yes,' lest it should fall into a 'Nestorian' division of the one Christ into two. In our days, the difficulties of the Chalcedonian doctrine have been felt more acutely than ever before. It is to the undying credit of Bishop Gore that he developed[5] in a new way the conception of a 'self-emptying' which included a suspension of knowledge.

We are confronted, then, by a simple question. If He, Who died on the cross, also shared the Father's glory before the world was, were these pre-natal experiences present to His mind during His earthly life or not? It is not too much to say that either answer is extremely unsatisfactory. A life lived on earth in full consciousness of all the facts of the Universe seems to be no real human life at all. But is the life of One Who is deliberately keeping His omniscience out of His mind any more a real human life than the other? Christ's real humanity is here at stake. It is not surprising that the younger theologians deny that their own doctrine is Kenotic.[6]

[4] *John* xvii, 5.

[5] Compare and contrast Ritschl's *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, Vol. III, paragraph 45 (4th edn.).

[6] Three important recent books — *Christus Veritas*, Father Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord*, Canon L. Hodgson's *And was made Man* — show the influence of Bishop Gore, but all of them are far from remaining simply at his point of view.

It is hoped sometimes that this uncomfortable antithesis can be avoided. 'Memory is of the past: the glory shared with the Father is not past but eternal.' Or again, '"Person" in the theological sense is not to be confused with "Person" in popular speech. We can attempt no psychology of a divine Hypostasis.'

Such suggestions are surely evasive. Christian believers generally have understood that He Who was with the Father at the Creation was the same Person as He Who died on Calvary, in the same sense in which a man is the same during his whole life. If we are not thinking of the one Christ as holding together His various experiences by a bond like that which we know in our own self-consciousness, are we giving any meaning to the unity of His Person at all? In Gethsemane—we may fairly ask—did He remember, or did He forget?

I suggest, then, that theology has been brought to a parting of the ways. We must ask an even more searching question. Can we abandon the whole doctrine of His pre-existence—from which all these difficulties arise—and yet retain the essentials of Catholic theology? The Christian doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation grew up primarily on the basis of the worship of Jesus: the conviction that this worship was His due and was consistent with the monotheism for which the Martyrs had died. It is secondary, but important, that these doctrines supplied a more satisfactory conception than was otherwise possible of God's inward bliss, God's love for God, of God's love for an object equal to Himself. Does such worship and such theology require absolutely a belief in the existence of our Lord before His human birth: or may we consistently with it conceive Him as beginning His existence at birth like the rest of mankind? Would the denial of His pre-existence deprive us of the belief that Jesus is our God and our Redeemer?

1. Begin with the question of worship. We read in the Gospel that we have 'seen His glory':[7] not that we have 'inferred' it or 'accepted it on authority.' Since it could be *seen* only in His earthly life—therefore for us only in the pages of Scripture—the text implies that we can find in the Gospel portrait suffi-

[7] *John* i, 14. *Cf. I John* i, 1; *II Cor.* iv, 6. See my article *Trinity* in the new *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

cient ground for believing Him the Son of God. Thus even the most old-fashioned orthodoxy must be concerned to maintain the sufficiency of the Gospel portrait to reveal His Godhead.

Many a simple reader, with the portrait before him, has accepted without resentment the claim of Jesus to be his judge. In spite of the modern dislike of the 'too faultless hero,' he does not here complain that faultlessness is itself a fault. Nor is he embarrassed if he detects occasional blemishes in the picture. A simple old believer remarked on John viii,[8] 'I am sure that our Lord never talked like that.' There is nothing illogical in such a saying. We often know a historical character well enough to reject some of the words attributed to him. The picture as a whole has impressed many readers as it impressed Beaudelaire, for whom Jesus was 'Des Dieux le plus incontestable.'[9]

The preacher, on the contrary, often fails to make the best of his case: partly from lack of a candid recognition that since our Lord was reported by His inferiors a few misrepresentations are nothing surprising: partly from a misuse of the phrase 'perfect man.' In the Creed the phrase means simply that our Lord possessed a human soul. To speak of His 'perfect life' or 'perfect teaching' merely causes confusion. There are valuable elements in human life of which He never spoke and which He never exhibited. The perfection, in the strict sense, belongs, not to His earthly life in isolation, but to the whole Universe which, according to St. Paul,[10] 'holds together in Him.'

But if 'perfection' is the wrong word, to the traditional term 'sinlessness' no similar objection arises. It is thoughtless to object here that we cannot prove a negative—that the utmost we could prove is that no sin is recorded of Him. There are characters in history about whom we can venture even upon denials. We know that Socrates would not have been wilfully the victim of a sophistry. We may well know enough of Jesus to perceive His extreme sensitiveness to sin. Nietzsche, who thought that if our Lord had lived to old age He would have corrected some of His teaching, added 'Noble enough was He to revoke.' It is no bolder a statement that He was too noble to

[8] viii, 44, 55. [9] *Les Fleurs du Mal*, cxxviii.
[10] *Colossians* i, 17.

make the high claims alleged in all the Gospels to be habitual with Him if He had not known that in no respect had He ever been unfaithful to His mission.

It is clear, at any rate,[11] that if we are to worship a teacher as God, we must first be convinced that His moral outlook can be accepted as final: that He has taught, not indeed every truth, but the absolute truth on the most important subjects: that He is so far permeated by the spirit of His own teaching that, in Harnack's words, He '*was* what He *taught*': that we can identify His personal claim with the claim of His teaching, so that loyalty to *Him* becomes indistinguishable from loyalty to *it*.

That many of His disciples in all ages have held that the Synoptists' portrait satisfied just these tests is plain. Consider the impression made by some of those passionate scenes in which His words indicate that the principles He taught were in full possession of His whole thought and feeling.[12] The Synoptists' story has ever been the chief support of the Catholic Christology.

The question for us in the present context is whether the simple man's impression is confirmed by critical reading. Learned reading does not always confirm it. Mr. McCabe, in an able book,[13] maintains that in our Lord's moral teaching there is nothing original at all. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, in a no less able book,[14] comes to a somewhat similar conclusion. 'There is not one reading,' says someone, 'of the historical Jesus, but half a dozen. Men have seen Him as political reformer, as fanatic (of various types), even as self-seeker.'[15]

But will anyone seriously maintain that the Gospels support all these readings equally? Mr. Aldous Huxley sees St. Francis as a snob.[16] Some people, again, have seen Socrates as a bore. But the world makes short work of such eccentric readings: and this is one of the cases where *securus judicat orbis terrarum*.

[11] About the *kind* of faultlessness required as a condition of worship interesting questions arise. It is admitted that some intellectual errors are consistent with Godhead. Should we rule out (as hymn-writers are disposed to do) the fretfulness of infancy, or similar impatience in dreams or of delirium, from the life of God Incarnate?

[12] *E.g. Mk.* x, 14; iii, 5; viii, 12; vi, 34; x, 21; *Luke* x, 21. For further examples see *Contemporary Review*, May, 1904, p. 743, etc.

[13] *The Sources of the Morality of the Gospels.*

[14] *The Riddle of the New Testament.*

[15] *Do what you will*, p. 143, etc.

The truth is that — as with Socrates, so with Jesus — one must see the importance of His main contentions before we can rightly estimate His character. Mr. McCabe denies the importance of the declaration that all meats are clean. This, Mr. McCabe thinks, is not moral teaching at all, but merely ceremonial teaching of local and passing interest.[17] To those who see in the Levitical Law of Holiness a greater sensitiveness to sin, a deeper seriousness and moral reverence, than existed elsewhere in the ancient world, the further purification of this Jewish morality will seem to be one of the greatest of ethical achievements.

Again, to understand Jesus we need first to understand Christianity. Of the higher religions of the world, each has its own method by which men seek peace with conscience, and this method dominates its whole ethical outlook. Its 'way of salvation' may be by asceticism—the cruder asceticism of Brahmanism, the more refined self-denial of the Buddhist—or again by 'good works.' But those who have contrasted Christian repentance and self-surrender with the asceticism or legalism of Indian or Jew—those who have let Christian penitence govern their lives—may reasonably claim to be in a better position to judge the portrait presented in the Gospels, not only in respect of its importance and of the teaching it indirectly conveys, but even of its truth to life.

Suppose, for the purpose of argument, that the portrait is fictitious—written (as the child said) 'to show what God would be like.' Even so, the Gospels are a remarkable phenomenon. They present, not as one might then have expected, a lay figure uttering unexceptionable sentiments, but a person described as fitting into a historical context and playing his part in the controversies of his time. We have only to read the Gospels to perceive how, in scene after scene, and saying after saying, the leading figure is adequate to the Christian conception of the divine mind and temper : so that the mind of Christ can be accepted as equivalent with the mind of God. On this hypothesis the few blemishes will be of no serious moment. If Homer nods, so may the 'first Christian generation.' Their presentation of their Ideal in personal form is none the less a masterly performance.

But obviously the portrait as a whole is *not* fictitious. The

[17] *Op. cit.*, p. 207, *cf.* p. 205.

capacity to recognize when a description, or a picture in the literal sense, is drawn from life is a very common human gift, much commoner than the capacity to frame and understand theological or even historical arguments. We may all give ourselves practice in this art by acquainting ourselves with the earliest literature which gathered round, say, Socrates, or again St. Francis. We shall not believe everything we read. But it will at least be plain to us that the *character* in both these cases was not fictitious, though myths may have gathered round them. Similarly, when once criticism has pointed out the inferiority of the Fourth Gospel as a 'source,' the ordinary reader will find it even easier than he has found it in past times to perceive that the Central Figure of the other Gospels is in the main drawn from life.

In this connection, the occasional blemishes in the Synoptic narrative become more important. They have been dealt with in various ways. When the Third Gospel tells us that the discourse against the Pharisees was delivered at a Pharisee's table, it has been pointed out that the First Gospel says that it was delivered 'to the multitudes.' Recent studies would favour the suggestion that neither Evangelist knew the scene of its delivery. Again, it has been argued that the theory that the destruction of the Gadarene swine was no part of the Master's intention finds confirmation in His immediate compliance with the request of the people.[18] In other contexts we may point out how in every age there are men of strong individuality who do rightly what might be acts in bad taste if done by others. But it is not necessary to go through the passages one by one and make plausible suggestions about what actually happened in each case. It is sufficient to affirm that if the unity of the character has vividly impressed itself upon our minds, it is no more uncritical here than in any other similar cases to reject words or incidents that are inconsistent with it. The *characters* of great men — as distinct from individual, and even 'characteristic,' *incidents*[19] — are among the most trustworthy objects of historical knowledge. No one would call it uncritical if we rejected an alleged letter of

[18] *Math.* v, 18.

[19] When a character is sufficiently well marked, the invention of characteristic incidents is easy. It may even take place without deceptive intention.

Hegel in his prime on the ground that its argument was utterly un-Hegelian. The few blemishes in the Synoptic Gospels — it is remarkable how few they are[20] — ought not to counteract the massive impression of unity derived from the rest of the narrative. At any rate, if our critical reading does indeed confirm the impression made habitually on persons of simple piety, that the mind of Christ as here expressed was not only the mind of a real man, but also can rightly be accepted as equivalent with the mind of God, does not such an estimate of Jesus by itself justify us in giving Him full divine worship? If Bishop Gore, for example, could have come into personal contact with Jesus as St. Peter did, and had been impelled to fall at His feet with St. Peter's confession of sin, is it really conceivable that he would have resisted this impulse till he had assured himself of the correctness of the Nicene theology? Would he not rather have yielded to this impulse on the conviction that it was in itself rational, and drawn his theological conclusions later?

2. 'Yes,' it may be said, 'if you identify thus the mind of Christ with the mind of God you may legitimately worship Jesus. But by a denial of His pre-existence you will inevitably impoverish theology. What becomes of the doctrine of the Logos?'

Now for those who had recognized Jesus as 'the image of the invisible God,' the conception of the Logos reconciled this recognition with monotheism and led up to the more developed

[20] The following is a pretty complete list of passages in the first three Gospels recording deeds or words which on various grounds have been judged unworthy of the Central Figure, as He is presented with remarkable consistency throughout the rest of the narrative. (In some of these passages words or actions are attributed to Him which seem to confirm superstitions of His day, in others extremely severe or even discourteous language. In some of the latter cases a very slight change would remove the impression, *e.g.* 'Ye have read' for 'Have ye never read?' Reflection on the *Formgeschichte* of the Gospels makes changes in transmission readily credible. Some, again, of the objections are due to narrowness of outlook in the objector, *e.g.* to the wish to read into Jesus the 'easy humanitarianism' (Hoskyns and Davey, p. 65) of the nineteenth century. The work of that century, however, will not be fairly judged if we forget the singular insight displayed in Matthew Arnold's *Literature and Dogma*.) *Mark* i, 25; ii, 25; iv, 12; iv, 39 (πεφίμωσο); v, 13; v, 30; vi, 7*c*; vi, 11; vii, 6, 27; ix, 19; x, 11-12; xi, 14; xii, 10, 38-40; xiv, 61.

Luke iv, 35, 39; vi, 3; viii, 46; ix, 5; ix, 41; xi, 37-44, 47-48; xi, 41 (R.V. margin), 50-51; xii, 10; xiii, 32; xix, 27; xx, 46; xxiii, 9.

Matthew ix, 13 (contrast xii, 7); xii, 32*b*, 34*a*, 45*c*; xvii, 17; xxi, 12, 16, 19; xxiii, 2-5*a*, 13, 33, 36; xxiv, 34; xxv, 46; xxvi, 24*c*, 63*a*; xxvii, 14.

theology of the Nicene Creed. Is it certain that it has any other religious value than this? The question is at least worth asking.[21]

'The God whom I worship,' said a lay theologian lately, 'is Triune.' He explained further that only a Triune God satisfied the demands of his *religion*. But is the revision here suggested really inconsistent with Trinitarianism? If we take seriously St. Paul's conception of the Body of Christ, then mankind is, for the Pauline theology, within the Trinity and not outside it. For an idealism for which sentient reality is the sole reality there is, indeed, no great difficulty in identifying the Body of Christ—the 'fulness' of 'redeemed mankind'[22]—with the world which is 'held together in Him.' If, again,[23] we translate (with the Revisers) 'The Spirit which He made to dwell in us He yearneth for even unto jealous envy,' we have at least the kernel of a theology of the Holy Ghost. We have here the impressive conception of a God passionately seeking to overcome the obstacles placed by our sin to His meeting that full response which His Spirit within us is stirring us to render, and only after long struggle, victorious. But if God has willed the victory, He has also willed the obstacles. The Hegelian recognition of evil, as the negative factor in the one process, is consistent in principle with an insistence, as impassioned as Barth's, on the vast contrast between evil and good, between man and God. At least theology needs re-thinking more fully than has been yet attempted in the light of the philosophy of Hegel, which, so far as its best teachings are concerned, once again seems to be coming to its own.

'Do you suggest, then,' it will be asked, 'that God had to wait till the birth of Christ before His own image confronted Him in His Son: or even that God has even yet no completely equal object of His love till His full purpose is realised, and all mankind gathered together in Christ?'

[21] The assertion of the co-eternity of the Son with the Father is one way—perhaps in some intellectual contexts an inevitable way—of expressing the Son's Godhead. We cannot abolish spatial and temporal categories, nor picture-thinking generally, from our religious thought. Thus, if once it is admitted that under these categories no completely self-consistent account of the Universe can be framed, the provisional admission into our theology of mutually inconsistent conceptions—as a stepping-stone to fuller comprehension—is not necessarily illegitimate.

[22] *Ephesians* i, 23; *Col.* i, 17. The animals are the only outstanding problem.

[23] *James* iv, 5. Margin.

The reply may fairly be made that no quite satisfactory theology is possible till we have reached more agreement than now exists on the problem of Time.[24] Yet meanwhile even popular religion is familiar with the conception of a God to Whom past and future are present; Who can declare the end from the beginning;[25] for Whom mankind gathered together in Christ may be the object of an eternal knowledge and love. If we hesitate to affirm our Lord's existence before His human birth, we cut ourselves off, no doubt, from the accustomed homiletic use of the Pauline account of His self-humiliation.[26] Yet the best part of the familiar faith we may still retain. We may still say that the Father has given His beloved Son: that the Holy One has accepted the death on the Cross. Does it concern us supremely when and where this act of self-surrender was first made? Some of our younger theologians, of unquestioned orthodoxy, have no love for the phrase 'He left the glories of heaven,' on which some of the rhetoric of the pupit is built up.[27]

At any rate no theology is mainly negative which justifies the worship of Jesus as God. It is a modern discovery that the 'Life of Christ' can never be written. This discovery is misunderstood if we conclude from it that we cannot know Jesus as a person of history: that history cannot present us with a character which compels our worship. It is no false sentimentalism which feels that the stories of the Synoptists are still the most joyful records in history. We may still distinguish what is 'given' in history from what, quite legitimately, we construct as theologians. We may still exclaim not merely *Jesu, dulcis spes*, but *Jesu dulcis memoria*. It is no false sentimentalism which sees in Jesus—even in the very severity of His demands upon us—the most joyful of all conceivable revelations of God,

Nam super mel et omnia
Ejus dulcis praesentia.

[24] Such a phrase as Brunner's 'Eternity is just as little the continuation of Time as it is that from which Time springs. Our temporality is a curved fragment of Eternity' can only mislead us. One criticism is suggested in advance by Lotze (Met., Bk. II, Ch. 3). Again, any temporal representation must give every event represented some temporal place.

[25] *Cf. Is.* xlvi, 10. *Acts* xv, 18, A.V.

[26] *Phil.* ii, 5-8.

[27] Contrast *Verbum supernum prodiens*
Nec patris linquens dexteram.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER*

By Professor Percy Gardner, LL.D., F.B.A.

THE career of Dr. Schweitzer has long been followed by liberal theologians in England. It is a career of vivid and many-sided interest. He calls the present record 'My life and thought,' and the designation is most appropriate, since with Schweitzer life and thought are intimately associated. But the life takes the lead and thought tries to keep in step with it. Indeed, while most theologians seek first truth and consistency, Schweitzer has lived out most of the religious problems of the day. And even those to whom his historic views seem perverted cannot fail to appreciate his devotion and persistency. It is a life of complete self-devotion and relentless following of ideals.

I remember well the time when Professor Sanday in Oxford and Professor Burkitt in Cambridge called attention to the writings of J. Weiss and A. Schweitzer, which set forth in an extreme and naked form the eschatalogical view of the interpretation of the Gospels, with no if or but, but in rigid dogmatic form. *Either* Jesus expected in the near future the end of the world *or* He did not; and if He did, all His teaching must be taken in the light of that anticipation. We are used to the German *entweder-oder*, and realize that though it often serves to clear the air and to destroy ineffective compromise, it very seldom turns out to be a new key to truth. I do not think many theologians would accept the eschatological theory in its extreme form; but Schweitzer has never withdrawn or modified it.

At the time in Germany its vogue was very great, and everything seemed to indicate for Schweitzer a brilliant professorial career. At thirty he was already Principal of the Theological College, the Collegium Wilhelmitanum, at Strassburg. But deeper needs of his nature than that which found satisfaction in an intellectual theory stirred within him. He became deeply impressed with the want and misery of many around him, and, as has been the case with many great Christians, a verse in the

**Albert Schweitzer. My Life and Thought.* An Autobiography. Translated by C. T. Campion. (Allen and Unwin; 1933. Price 7/6.)

Gospels burned itself into his heart: 'Whosoever would save his life shall lose it, but whosoever will lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's shall save it.' He found it impossible to accept the easy surroundings of a learned life, and determined to give himself to some direct service to mankind. After considering plans possible in Europe, he was carried away by a magazine article by A. Boegner, President of the Paris Missionary Society, and resolved to offer himself for service in the Congo Français. He had to give up all that he valued, to become once more a student instead of the Head of a College, and to train himself in medicine, since he was sure that only by combining medicine with evangelical work he could force his way into the hearts of the Africans. So he passed into a laborious apprenticeship, which seems to have gone much against the grain, as it naturally would to one so devoted to philosophy and history. It was in some degree a compromise that he took as the subject of his doctoral dissertation the question whether the Jesus whom he had learned from historic study to recognize could from the medical point of view be regarded as quite sound in mind, or whether He was an example of what the medical writers call paranoia, a disease of the mind. Fortunately he found himself able, after a profound study of the whole problem, to vindicate His complete sanity.

Other difficulties arose. The Missionary Committee at Paris was very unwilling to send out a man who was noted for extreme critical views, but at last passed him on condition that he did no theological teaching to disturb the minds of the converts. For a time he remained in great poverty, often even not having sufficient food: but being an accomplished musician and a great authority on the works of Bach, he was able by degrees to acquire funds through public performances.

We need not follow Schweitzer into his African hospital and dispensary, which became a very great institution, nor into his missionary work. But one must notice as a proof of the malignant nature of war, that when the Great War came the French authorities could find no better use to make of so great a spiritual and medical force than to shut him up in a concentration camp. What will probably most interest Churchmen, and especially the readers of this journal, is the reactions of a nature

so simple and ingenuous as Schweitzer's to the problems and difficulties of modernity.

Some of these arose in connection with the missionary career. Schweitzer saw clearly that the pietistic desire to save souls was a stronger stimulus to devotion than the liberal desire 'to set the Gospel working primarily as a force for the restoration of mankind and the conditions of human society in the heathen world.' But in practical working he did not find his critical temper a drawback. His principal object was to 'preach the elements of the Gospel as given in the Sermon on the Mount, and to bring men under the lordship of the Spirit of Jesus.' In Central Africa, just as among the early Christians, it was not historical or metaphysical theories which disturbed the minds of the converts, but the heathen tradition as opposed to the Christian religion of love. An amusing story is told how in a discussion among the Christian teachers, a native preacher set aside a statement of Schweitzer on the ground that he was not a 'theologian like us' but only a doctor.

It is interesting to learn in the case of a man so variously accomplished—philosopher, historian, physician, musician, with a strong bent towards practical life—what studies seemed to him of most value to the building up of character and personality. As one might expect, all studies take a strong ethico-religious tinge. Natural science delighted him as concerned with truths which embodied realities, so that every statement and law had to be justified with facts, and mere opinion was held in little respect. Everything had to be determined with exactitude. But the pursuit of facts did not make him undervalue the Humanities:

> 'Through my study of chemistry, physics, zoology, botany and physiology, I became more than ever conscious to what an extent truth in thought is justified and necessary, side by side with the truth which is merely established by facts. Such knowledge is on a higher plane than the knowledge based only on facts. The nature of the living Being without me I can understand only through the living Being which is within me. It is to this reflective knowledge of the Universal Being, and of the relation to it of the individual human being, that the Humanities seek to attain.'

Such is the view, expressed in German abstractions, to which Schweitzer was led by the continual labours and untiring energy of a life wholly devoted to the service of humanity; and as such

we must value it. Later, during the enforced leisure of the war-time, the writer became more ambitious, and tried to work out a Weltanschauung, a general view of human affairs or a philosophy of civilization. He amends the 'cogito ergo sum' of Descartes, from which modern philosophy takes its rise, in a pragmatist sense: 'The most immediate fact of man's consciousness is the assertion: "I am life which wills to live, in the midst of life which wills to live."' To Schweitzer reverence for life is the final principle of ethics, and to destroy life, if it be capable of development, is the sum of evil. A German must have a Weltanschauung, but a fanatical reverence for life does not seem entirely in place in a physician, one of whose chief occupations must be the destruction of all germs which appear to him noxious.

I am no musician, and therefore cannot write about the theories as to music, and in particular about Bach, which have taken so great a part in Schweitzer's life. He had in Africa an organ, presented by friends in Paris, and it is clear that, especially when he was cut off from his regular medical work, he derived from this organ a great consolation. It might be anticipated that a nature so ethical and imaginative would not regard music from any materialist point of view. Of Bach he says:

> 'His music is poetic and pictorial because its themes are born of poetic and pictorial ideas. Music appeals to the creative imagination of the hearer.'

But further development of this theme I must leave to others.

Many people in England will wonder, as did the Missionary Committee at Paris, how one who was fully persuaded of the strict intellectual limits of Jesus, who thought that His views as to the coming end of the world and on many other subjects were mistaken, and merely adopted from the teaching of the eschatologists among contemporary Jews, could have a satisfactory gospel to preach. His answer to such doubts is of a purely practical or activist character:

> 'The historical Jesus moves us deeply by His subordination to God. In this He stands out as greater than the Christ personality of dogma, which, in compliance with the claims of Greek metaphysics, is conceived as omniscient and incapable of error. The true understanding is of will acting on will. The true relation to Him is to be taken possession of by Him. Christian piety of any and every sort is valuable only so far as it means the surrender of our will to His.'

This explanation will not saisfy everyone. Many will see in it a fresh instance of the either-or spirit of German dogmatism. But what no one can deny is that such an activist view is capable of stirring believers to an active self-surrender and a devoted missionary zeal. Of this the *Life* before us is incontrovertible proof. To me it seems at any rate vastly superior to a merely materialistic reliance on sacrament, or, at the other extreme, to a merely emotional religion which thinks more of feeling than of action, and is very apt to drift into antinomianism. But whether it cannot be made more rationally satisfying by a basis of reason and philosophy is another and more difficult question. The intellect has its rights in Christianity as well as feeling and will, and cannot be merely ordered off the premises.

And of course the intellectual side of Schweitzer had had a very severe training. A theologian who had studied philosophy at Strassburg and Berlin under such teachers as Windleband, Ziegler and Zeller, and theology under Harnack, Pfleiderer, Kaftan and Simmel, must have been very proficient. For Harnack in particular he expresses a boundless admiration. He could hardly have depreciated the function of thought in religion. But he seems to have found a way of taking apart the scientific and the emotional approaches to the religion of Christ.

In a final chapter, or epilogue, Dr. Schweitzer tries to go deeper, and to sketch his reactions to the superficiality or scepticism of the time. I shall not try to summarize it. It requires close attention, and then, to me at least, it does not seem quite self-consistent or complete. But it certainly does not conform to the view that thinking is unnecessary to the Christian life. On the contrary, the writer says :

> 'With the spirit of the age I am in complete disagreement, because it is filled with disdain for thinking. To-day, in addition to that neglect of thought, is also prevalent a mistrust of it. It will ever remain incomprehensible that our generation, which has shown itself so great by its achievements in discovery and invention, could fall so low spiritually as to give up thinking.'

This paradox I must leave to the reader to solve.

THE LEGEND OF NEWMAN*

By F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, B.A., St. Peter's Hall, Oxford; Liddon Student.

THE coming centenary of the Oxford Movement has naturally re-directed attention to the central figure of Newman. Anglo-Catholics bewail his secession and loss to the English Church. Again, Roman Catholics urge his relationship to a liberal and scholarly Catholicism and claim deep and abiding value for his 'Essay on Development.' When this work was published, the Unitarians of Boston claimed it as showing that the doctrine of the Trinity was no older than the third century, the Roman Catholic hierarchy in America was furious, and Newman, who was then resident in Rome, having been recently converted, was made to feel that 'facts,' not 'philosophising,' was what the Roman Church required. To-day, the standpoint of this essay and that of the pragmatist 'Grammar of Assent' is tacitly accepted as the groundwork of much Roman Catholic apologetics. Newman has become a central figure in latter-day Catholicism and the literature which has grown up around him is steadily on the increase.

Three new volumes have recently appeared as contributions to the literature of Newman. Mr. Lewis May draws a picture of one who has received his respect and interest for many years. In an attractive and winning manner he tells the life-story of the great Cardinal not as a biography but as a study. Yet the lights and shades are absent, and one is forced to doubt whether it presents a completed portrait of Newman's character and whether his weaknesses can be dismissed in the rather light-hearted manner assumed by Mr. Lewis May. His study is beautiful in its presentation of what was one side of the Cardinal's nature, but at the same time it remains a picture essentially ill-balanced. The subtle undercurrents which played so great a part in Newman's character are ignored. The Rev. Alfred Fawkes once

* *Cardinal Newman*, by J. Lewis May, pp. xi + 264 (Geoffrey Bles, 5/-). *Kingsley versus Newman: The Full Text*, pp. xxxi + 528 (Oxford University Press, 7/6). *A Newman Synthesis*, pp. xiii + 379 (Sheed and Ward, 5/-).

wrote of Newman: 'His transports of emotion were tempestuous. . . . Such a temper is not normal; one cannot mistake the overstrain.'[1] Yet of this there is but little hint in Mr. May's beautifully-told story. The reader is perhaps too enthralled and fails to pause and question. For example, in the story of the clash between Newman and Charles Kingsley, the sympathy of the reader is compelled to go out to Newman, and he forgets to inquire how far Kingsley was correct and how far he blundered. It is at this point that the Oxford University Press has performed a singularly useful service. By re-issuing in a popular form not only the *Apologia*, but the full text of the pamphlets which led up to its writing, it has placed the relevant documents, together with an excellent introduction by Mr. Wilfred Ward, within easy reach of all who wish to know the real truth. Perhaps the suggestion may be made that a subsequent edition might embody a pamphlet famous in its day, 'But is not Kingsley right after all?' by the Rev. F. J. Meyrick. It is so often assumed that Kingsley's attack was incorrect, ill-timed, and in questionable taste, that this summary of the controversy, which was written after a lapse of years and which summed up in general in Kingsley's favour, should at least merit some attention. There can be no doubt that Kingsley did blunder. He attacked the general attitude to truth adopted by Roman clergy and went out of his way to mention in particular the frail old man living in retirement at his Birmingham Oratory, supporting his charge by a quotation from a sermon which Newman preached whilst he was still the Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford. The result was a heated controversy in which the plain common-sense of Kingsley suffered severely from his opponent's dialectical skill and from the production of a religious classic, the *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*. Public sympathy passed to the side of Newman. But the matter cannot really be left here. Kingsley erred in bringing Newman's name into connection with his general charge, and he erred in refusing to retract the offending words. But these errors do not substantiate either the falsity of the charge as a whole or the correctness of Newman's position. After all, it was Newman himself who made the angry exclamation, 'As if evidence was the test of truth!' Mr. Fawkes sums up Newman's

[1] A. Fawkes, *Studies in Modernism*, p. 26.

position well when he says, 'Reasoning meant more to him than truth, tradition than testimony.'[2] It was this attitude of mind which Kingsley could never understand and his reprobation of which led to his severe defeat. But the question must always remain, 'Is not Kingsley right after all?' and it may well be that the time has come for a re-assessment of the whole controversy.

Newman as a theologian is to-day rather a pitiful figure. He made the discovery of 'the illative sense,' but it was long ago forgotten by philosophers, theologians and psychologists alike. He made the period of the Arian Controversy his own, but Professor Gwatkin did not deem it necessary to make any remarks upon his work on the subject. Of his Biblical scholarship it is unnecessary to speak. He never learned to read German, and in his Oxford days the name of Strauss remained unknown to him. Rumbles from across the channel were warning of the coming thunder. James Martineau was already making the conclusions of the Tubingen critics known to English readers. George Eliot had translated Strauss. Hennell was shocking England by his heresies. But all this was unknown to Newman. Brought up in an Evangelical atmosphere of strict Biblical literalism, there are no signs that he ever changed in this respect, and to the end his treatment of the Bible remained that of the unreformed Oxford of the 'thirties. His pulpit commentary on the slaughter of the Canaanites by the Israelite tribesmen under Joshua is famous: 'Doubtless, as they slew those who suffered for the sins of their fathers, their thoughts turned, first to the fall of Adam, next to that unseen state where inequalities are righted.'[3] Yet there is another side. There is much deep thought in Newman, hidden away in the multitude of volumes which he produced in his lifetime and the very bulk of which frightens the student. A continental Jesuit, Fr. Przywara, has issued in German a selection of passages from Newman arranged under subject headings, and Messrs. Sheed & Ward have added a translation of it to their Hart Library, a well-bound and well-produced series. Of course, the ideal would be to read the works of Newman for oneself, but for the many to whom time is lacking for such a task and yet who wish to make the acquaintance of the

[2] A. Fawkes, *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[3] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, iii, 187.

author at first hand, it would be difficult to imagine anything more useful than Fr. Przywara's 'A Newman Synthesis,' which is so arranged as to give Newman's theological views in his own words.

Enough has been said to suggest that there is a Newman legend in much the same way as there is a Keble legend or a Pusey legend. On the one hand there is the figure as painted by so devout an admirer as Mr. Lewis May of a leader of contemporary thought, faultless in character, and on the other hand there is the picture as painted by Mr. Lytton Strachey of a rather weather-beaten old man, which is the impression that author would seem to convey as the aged Cardinal totters from the stage of the eminent Victorians. The two are quite irreconcilable.

The question arises as to whether there was an inherent defect of character which explains the strangeness of Newman's career. He rises to a position of fame in the Anglican Church and catches the ear of the Oxford of his day; he secedes to Rome and is all but forgotten by the world at large until a chance controversy and the writing of the *Apologia* restore him as a public figure. That figure remains, a vague myth culled from the *Apologia*, but his writings and sermons are alike forgotten. His portait hangs with the great of his day in the National Portrait Gallery, but the volumes of his collected works lie scattered and neglected on the second-hand bookstall. Mr. May tells how some time ago he happened to hear the names of Newman and Carlyle mentioned in the presence of a well-known novelist and playwright. 'Carlyle . . . Newman . . ,' mused the great man, with rather a compassionate smile, 'who reads them now, I wonder.'[4] Mr. May retorts that that is so much the worse for the modern world, but it may be questioned whether this retort is really satisfactory. Two other suggestions may be made for this neglect — Newman's effeminacy and his hatred of Liberalism in an age when the tide was setting in that direction. The Newman of legend never existed. He was but a figment of the popular imagination and remains so still. One would gladly let it rest at that and allow the legend to remain. Nearly half a century has gone by since the Cardinal, worn by age and infirmity, rejoined his devoted friend Ambrose St. John

[4] Lewis May, *Ibid.*, p. 176.

and was laid to rest with him in the little burial ground of the Oratory at Birmingham. The blessing of his own Church, *Requiescat in Pace*, was re-echoed by thousands far removed from him in theological affinities. Newman had for ever left his haven of rest at the Oratory for his eternal rest. But, when the name and the legend of Newman is used by Roman Catholics and by Anglo-Catholics alike for controversial ends, the time has come for a statement of the truth and the killing of the legend. An understanding of the psychology of Newman is the key to his career.

Shortly after Cardinal Newman died in 1890, the late Sir William Robertson Nicholl prevailed upon A. W. Hutton, who incidentally is by no means to be confused with that devout admirer of Newman, R. H. Hutton of *The Spectator*, to write a series of reminiscences of the Cardinal for *The Expositor*. Mr. Hutton had been a priest working with Newman at the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. Losing his faith in the Church of Rome, he left Newman, and it was during his period of religious unrest that *The Expositor* articles were written. He entered the Anglican Church some years later. As in his Lives of Manning and Newman in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, there is nothing of bitterness in Mr. Hutton's articles. He retained his admiration of the Cardinal to the end, but it was an admiration tempered with discretion. Beneath the even flow of the story of the Cardinal's daily life are hints of weakness. There can be but little doubt that there was much that was effeminate in Newman's outlook. At once tender and yet capable of bitter hatred, a respecter of persons and yet domineering, a lover of men and yet one who disliked women, super-sensitive, Newman stands out in his effeminacy as belonging almost to a decadent type. It is curious that Mr. Lewis May is not without some inkling of this. It is Mr. May who remarks of Newman that 'there was something ladylike about him';[5] it is Mr. May who, in telling the story of the summoning to Rome of Newman and Ambrose St. John, shortly after conversion, remarks that 'there is something faintly suggestive about their restrained excitement, about their comments on sights and incidents and people, of a pair of High School misses doing the *grand tour*';[6] and it is Mr. May who

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[6] *Ibid*, p. 79.

notices in the community of Newman and his friends, when they were living at Old Oscott immediately after their reception into the Roman Church, 'a faint hint of old-maidishness in the gentleness of it.'[7] Such slight hints, when linked up with Mr. Hutton's memories, fully justify the charge of effeminacy.

It is strange to think of the great preacher of St. Mary's, Oxford, as preaching sermons apparently unprepared and without plan or point, and to learn that 'indolence and a sort of contempt for the congregation he had to address were partly responsible for them.'[8] Yet such was the preacher that Mr. Hutton remembered. The character giving rise to such an attitude of mind is not pleasant. Again, in his dealings with his community he failed as a leader. 'That Newman was a successful ruler of men or an able administrator of affairs he would never have thought of claiming. In his relations with persons he showed a marked favouritism, such as is commonly and naturally a characteristic — I do not mean, of course, in any gross sense — of celibates. With sundry of the older members of his community—men who had followed him and had lived with him beneath the same roof for years—he would be for long periods barely on speaking terms. Not that he was hostile to them; he was simply indifferent.'[9] After this, it is not surprising to learn that 'Newman was emphatically what Dr. Johnson calls a good hater.'[10] That Mr. Hutton here spoke from personal experience may be seen from two stories he tells of how he personally annoyed the Cardinal, once with regard to the inclusion of subject-matter in a book which he was preparing, and once with regard to the extension of the public elementary schools. 'The violence of feeling aroused in him by this (last) project was nothing short of painful.'[11] It is an interesting sidelight on the Kingsley controversy that Newman in a letter to Sir William Cope practically admitted that his indignation was all 'put on.'[12] It is pleasant to learn from Mr. Lewis May that, immediately upon hearing of Kingsley's death, Newman said Mass for his soul,[13] but if his indignation at the time of the quarrel was merely worked up in

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[8] *The Expositor*, 1890, p. 238.
[9] Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 305.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 305.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 338.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 340.
[13] May, *Ibid.*, p. 174.

order to gain a public hearing,[14] it is an apt illustration of that domineering manner of which Mr. Hutton tells.

It is pleasanter to turn to the devoted love which Newman showed to some members of his community. 'No man was ever more responsive to personal reverence and affection, and towards those who thus approached him he showed a friendship that can but be described as love.'[15] Newman himself has written in his *Apologia* of the tenderness which he felt for Fr. Ambrose St. John—and incidentally of the dislike which he felt for W. G. Ward—and the death of this friend in 1875 left a cruel gap in the Cardinal's last years. No other ever filled that vacant place. Fr. William Neville might be valued highly, some newcomer to the Oratory might experience close friendship with the venerable priest, but it was the ghost of Fr. Ambrose St. John which remained with the Cardinal for the last fifteen years of his life. Of his dislike for women it is not possible to speak so kindly. He was naturally shy and sensitive; for example, the coarseness of the confessional in a large town repelled him;[16] but it is one of the faults of the celibate system that it tends to degrade all love between man and woman, and Newman 'was never able to distinguish between such love and lust.'[17] It may be that there were a few women for whom he entertained a sincere regard, such as Miss Giberne, described by Thomas Mozley as 'the prima donna of the Tractarian movement,' with whom he frequently corresponded, and he wrote to a few other ladies. 'But on the whole he held the sex in something like contempt. "You know I think them great liars," he once said to me, smiling; and then seemed shocked at his own boldness.'[18] That this attitude was to him a life-governing principle, the following story shows. 'He was strict, too, about the rules which excluded women from the rooms of the Oratory, though such rules are generally absurd enough in their operation. When one of the community, for example, was dangerously ill from pleurisy, his mother was not allowed to come up to his room to see him, the exclusion being due doubtless to his fear of making a precedent.'[19]

[14] *Cf.* Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 340.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 306.
[16] *Cf.* Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 317.
[17] Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 310.
[18] Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 311.
[19] Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 311.

The Newman whom Mr. Hutton knew possessed, too, a fussy love of personal dignity which was lacking in the earlier Newman. The honorary fellowship which his old college, Trinity, bestowed upon him and, later, his appointment to the sacred college, gave the old man an inordinate pleasure. When he had become a cardinal, 'Newman wore habitually more of the insignia of his rank than there was any need for him to have done.'[20] There was a certain conscious assertion of his belief in himself and the natural dignity accruing to a Prince of the Church, but Mr. Hutton would maintain it was free from any element of posing or vulgarity. 'His taking a kind of childlike pleasure in ecclesiastical costume and in Church ceremonial is quite consistent with this, and I must not be taken to imply that it was vanity, still less vulgar ostentation, that made him apparently delight in wearing the imposing robes of a cardinal when he assisted at high mass. Vulgarity is indeed the very last thing that one can associate with him.'[21] Newman was always weak in that he was intensely superstitious. Mr. Lytton Strachey's remark that in boyhood Newman wished the *Arabian Nights* true, and in manhood would seem to have found his wish granted, has become famous. On Mr. Hutton he left the impression that 'he was never free from a somewhat superstitious habit of mind.'[22] He accepted the Mediaeval miracles without any attempt at discrimination, although here he was allowed that liberty by his Church. The universe was a cluster of mysteries, and even astrology was not to be placed out of court; he would point out that 'The stars in their courses fought against Sisera.' In the *Apologia* Newman admits that as a boy he was superstitious; he must be charged with remaining so as a man.

Theologically, Newman was out-of-date even towards the end of his own lifetime. On the positive side, he had gradually grown into the practices of Italian Romanism. Whilst he opposed the Ultramontanes on political grounds, as in 1870, yet he was at one with them devotionally. The extravagances of mariolatry in no way repelled him. 'Newman was responsible for the introduction at the Oratory of the "Raccoltá," a collection of popular Italian devotions translated into English by Fr.

[20] Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 339. [21] Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 339.
[22] Hutton, *Ibid.*, p. 309.

Ambrose St. John"[23] — a work of 'indulgenced' prayers containing singularly outspoken adoration of Our Lady and the saints. Such prayers are in no way incumbent upon any individual Roman Catholic and are quite un-English in tone, yet night after night Newman knelt before the gaudily-painted statue of the Virgin in the Oratory leading the devotions with these prayers. 'To attempt to revive the defunct English Catholicism of the Middle Ages seemed to him to savour of heresy,'[24] and he preferred the Italian to any other type of Catholicism, a preference which he carried into ecclesiastical architecture. Eschewing asceticism, his theology was one of personal experience. So too, indeed, was that of Luther, but unlike the experience of the Reformer, Newman's led straight on to a position

> '. . . under Mary's smile,
> And Peter's royal feet.'

Friendly as Newman was in his later years with many Anglicans, including Dean Church, yet he showed no signs of wishing to return to the Church of England. No lingering doubt suggested to him that it was a true branch of the Catholic Church. Years before, he had convinced himself that the Anglicans were in the position of the Donatists — a completely unhistoric parallel — and that was his conviction to the end. Tractarian theology was for ever rejected.

But it is as an opponent of Liberalism that Newman was most against the spirit of his day, and he has recorded his hatred of this movement in a note appended to the *Apologia*, which Mr. Lewis May reprints.[25] It is strange, in reading such an outburst as this, to realize that such great Liberals as Matthew Arnold, James Martineau and John Ruskin were contemporaries of the Cardinal. He was completely out of sympathy with the direction in which English thought was tending and with the movement in favour of Liberal Christianity and social reform which, taking its rise in England with the 'sixties of the last century, has continued to the present day. That he was 'the unwilling father of Modernism' is out of the question. Could he have lived to see it, the movement headed by such Modernists as Loisy or Tyrrell would have met with no severer reprobation than from Cardinal

[23] Hutton, p. 235. [24] Hutton, p. 236. [25] May, *Ibid.*, p. 214 *ff.*

Newman. But he died before the rise of such a movement, still looking back to the Church of the early centuries, stern and unbending to the last. The spirit which led him to separate entirely from his younger brother, Professor Francis Newman, on grounds of a theological difference over baptism, was the guiding spirit of his life. Effeminate and reactionary, the true Newman is forgotten to-day. His faded poetry appears in no modern anthology, his once famous prose, so academically impeccable, remains unread. He bears no relation to modern life, but is as a figure from the past which has become a legend. And that legend, when examined, is seen to be no more than a legend. With many others, it fades 'into the light of common day.'

RELIGION IN SPAIN

By the Rev. C. H. Grimes, M.A., F.R.G.S., British Chaplain, Barcelona; Officier de l'Instruction Publique.

AS it is now two years since the Revolution took place in Spain, it may be worth while to try and estimate its effect on the religious life of the people. To put it briefly, Communism and Agnosticism have been the chief gainers. However, let us examine the situation more closely. Just now the Cortes is finishing off 'El proyecto de las congregaciones religiosas' which is to regulate the relations between Church and State in future. The terms of the proposed Law seem to Roman Catholics very drastic, but I do not think that the Government are really opposed to religion; indeed, the President of the Commission which was charged with drawing up this scheme said, when replying to a deputation of the united Protestant Churches which waited upon him, 'I am neither a Roman Catholic nor a Protestant, but I am certainly in favour of religious teaching in Spain.' He went on also to say that in future he hoped that the Government would not discriminate in favour of any one religion.

Though Spain is to-day predominantly Roman Catholic, there being officially only some 10,000 Protestants in a population of twenty-two millions, yet in the debates in the Cortes on

the Proyecto the number of deputies who have consistently supported the Roman position has never exceeded twenty; but it must be admitted that at the last election the parties of the Right from which the Roman Church draws nearly all its support were so cowed that they only polled a very small fraction of their proper number of votes.

It has been very helpful to follow these debates and to read the sentiments expressed, and on the whole the Traditionalists, or the Roman Catholic party, seem to have had a fair hearing, though practically every amendment they have brought forward has been thrown out—the Government fearing that if they permitted any, then the debate would drag on interminably.

Thus one of the terms of the proposed Law only permits services outside the church when the alcalde has given his consent. It appears, however, that to take the *viaticum* to a sick man would come under this heading, and it would obviously be a hardship to have to go to the alcalde, who might be away, or a man utterly opposed to the Church, to ask permission at a moment's notice for such a service. The Minister in charge admitted that in drawing up the measure they had not intended to include this, yet for fear of obstruction refused to accept an amendment. But such things in Spain will no doubt easily arrange themselves. Another difficulty with regard to sick people has arisen, the Government having already made a law that no person should be buried with a religious rite unless in his lifetime he had signed a paper to that effect before witnesses and it had been registered at the Ayuntamiento. This was done to prevent the priests and nuns making supposed converts when the people were unconscious; but it again involves considerable hardships, since people in their lifetime put off such things.

During these debates the Roman Catholic orators have often spoken of the persecution of the Church, but on one occasion the Minister of Justice reminded them that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and that when they were in power they had not scrupled to burn their opponents alive, while to-day at the most it was a question of taking from them some of their goods. He reminded them also that their persecuting days were not finished, for recently they had excommunicated the Dean of Granada, who is one of the Deputies.

The reason for this has not been officially stated, but it is said to be because he voted for the Divorce Law. Other speakers have reminded them that even pious Catholic Sovereigns of Spain had found it necessary in the past to take some such action as they were taking to curb their wealth and power, for in fact the goods of the Church have more than once been confiscated.

The chief provisions of the Proyeto are :

i. That all the cathedrals and churches, together with the rectories and glebes, become national property, though the Church is allowed the use of them.

ii. All the vessels and art treasures and furniture generally is declared State property and cannot be alienated, as has been the case at times in the past when the Church was poor or the priests greedy.

iii. The bishops and all high ecclesiastical officers must be Spaniards, and so must the Heads of all the Orders, and among the Orders only a small proportion can be foreigners.

iv. All the bishops must have the approval of the State before they can exercise their functions.

v. No religious orders can indulge in trade.

vi. Both the Orders and the Churches must keep accounts open to the inspection of the Government, and if the Government think that the income is more than their needs justify, then the Government has the right to take a proportion of it.

Here there is a curious provision which shows that ecclesiastical honesty is not rated very highly, for it states that if the actual income should be twice the income declared, then the Government has the power to close the House or the Church completely; but if the error is a smaller one, then only for one year.

However, people who like Chartreuse, for example, will be glad to know that the law appears to be satisfied if the Brethren form a lay association for the purpose of manufacturing the liqueur and pay the usual taxes. Indeed, this custom in the past of the monasteries and nunneries paying no taxes, and so competing on unfair terms with other private businesses that had to pay taxes, was a cause of their wealth and also of their being so thoroughly hated. For instance, poor women trying to make a little money by sewing or washing found themselves often unable to do so, except at impossibly low prices, owing to the competition of the women of religious orders.

But the provision of the Proyecto with regard to religious teaching has rightly been regarded as the most important of all.

The proposal is that after a fixed date no teaching by the Orders should be permitted; it seems to be that the religious Orders may continue teaching, but that they must give no religious teaching in school hours or even in school buildings, and their teaching can only be given in schools which are open to all and do not definitely belong to an Order, while only those persons are to be allowed to teach who possess a certificate from the Government that they are qualified teachers. If the latter clause is carried out, then the teaching will be definitely very much better, for to-day one often hears it said that the nuns are sweet women but that they know nothing, and that the greater part of the school time is taken up with reciting prayers or instruction in needlework, painting, etc. Hence most Spanish women are almost illiterate. The present Government have certainly shown themselves the friends of education, and on the whole this seems to be a wise compromise at which they have arrived.

It is true that the Jesuits were turned out of Spain a year ago, but many of them, knowing their countrymen quite well, are now back again continuing their teaching in private buildings, having turned their collars round, only they have lost their fine buildings which the Government took over. In adopting an attitude of hostility to the teaching of the religious Orders, the Government have done so chiefly on the ground that the Church was in the past one of the great props of the Monarchy and is hardly likely to have changed in so short a time, and no one else believes it has.

Protestant ministers to whom I have spoken agree that the high hopes they had entertained of winning over a large number of converts when they had a free hand and Roman Catholicism was no longer the established religion have been doomed to failure. They say that to-day men are so occupied with their material concerns that they have no time for religion, and also that religion was so much used as a political weapon in the past by the priests that now it is inseparably so connected in their minds. At the same time one feels that the Protestants, few in numbers and split up among numerous sects, are utterly unable to rise to the present occasion. Undoubtedly the Spaniard is incurably religious; his whole past history shows the hold religion has had on him, almost every novel proclaims it, while his asso-

ciation with the Moors, lasting over centuries, has tinged him with much of their fanaticism. A friend told me that away in a mountain village in the North, getting up early at 4 a.m. one morning to go on an expedition, he was much impressed by seeing the villagers at this early hour streaming up the hillside, on foot and on bicycles, to take part in the Mass before going to their work. Where in England have we anything to compare to this?

Roman Catholicism in a purified form would no doubt appeal best to most Spaniards, but there are many among the more intelligent youth at the universities, etc., who revolt from the gross superstitions that they have been taught, and to whom an enlightened Christianity would make a stronger appeal. But Protestantism so far has done nothing for these, though I hear that two or three clever and devout Protestant students are applying for university chairs, believing that in this way they can do more good than by becoming pastors. Too much of the Protestant teaching to-day would seem to be of the polemic order, and there is great need for such a magazine as the *Modern Churchman* to circulate here. If some effort is not made to influence spiritually the youthful intelligentsia, one fears for the future of Spain, knowing how easily their youthful idealism may be turned into the channels of Fascism, or Communism, or debauchery. For my own part I believe, from what I know of these youths, that there are among them very many fine and attractive personalities, both men and women, who are willing to spend and be spent in the service of their country, who realise that religion is the basis of a country's welfare, and who are working to make a new Spain rise out of the ruins of the old, true to the great traditions of her past.

Among the workers, I believe, though many of them hate the Orders as living in luxury while condemning them to live often in great poverty, for their cura there is often a genuine respect and affection, and much sympathy is expressed on all hands for the country cura who, deprived as he will be very shortly of his small Government pittance, will have to live a harder life than themselves, unless the Church by a wise use of its funds can come to his assistance. I have heard, however, of villages in the Pyrenees where the cura and the alcalde had

united to bully the inhabitants, and after the Revolution these were both told by the villagers to go without waiting for orders from any, and then the villagers employed, when they wanted them, curas who were more popular. But the Church as a whole is probably not rich, the great wealth being in the private possession of the Orders, and if the result of the Government's policy is to reduce these both in numbers and wealth it will be all to the good. The support of such a great number of men and women in economic idleness has been too heavy a burden for a poor country, while obviously among such a body of men and women endowed with the Latin temperament there have been many lapses from the vow of chastity. (The Spaniard, indeed, says that this vow is enforced for the practical reason that women would not confess to a married priest.)

Protestantism, which will no doubt ultimately come into its own under the new conditions of freedom, will perhaps make its greatest contribution to Spanish life in upholding the moral law no less in business than in sexual relations, for many Spaniards are willing to confess that honesty is not an outstanding national quality, and the failure of it pollutes as much their political life as their business relations.

It will also keep in check those superstitions which grow so readily on Spanish Latin soil, and I enclose two documents, which I bought for the small sum of 2 pesetas, which between them seem to let me off a great deal of fasting in Lent on the ground that the Spaniards fought so valiantly in the Crusades. Other bulls, I am told, can be bought by which a man who has stolen money gets absolution for it if he now does not know the owner. If the sum involved is 10 pesetas, the Indulgence costs one peseta, and so on *pro rata*. It seems hard to believe that in the twentieth century such things can be hawked about the streets of a great city like Barcelona.

Finally, Protestantism will no doubt supply a spiritual home to those more critical spirits who cannot reconcile themselves with the doctrine and practice of Rome. Thus we cannot but believe that the future holds great things for this loveable race, who, great believers in it as they are, have taken for themselves the fine motto, *Plus ultra*.

ORPHISM AND CHRISTIANITY

By Charles King, B.A. (Oxon), M.A. (Lond.),
Translator of the *Cloud Messenger* of Kalidasa from the Sanskrit.

MUCH attention has been devoted in recent years to the study of the relations between Christianity and the 'mystery religions' of the ancient world, but I do not think it is even yet realized to how very notable a degree Orphism in particular was a forerunner of the Faith. To attempt to weigh in the scales of criticism so intangible an entity as 'influence' always seems the undertaking, to use the words of Plato, of a 'too laborious and not altogether happy' man; to detect 'influence' wherever one finds similarity of idea is to forget that experience is individual, and that similarity of idea may well arise from uncovenanted similarity of experience; in particular, to endeavour, at this distance of time, and with the 'broken lights' which are all we have, to estimate the total of the influence of Orphism on Christianity would be the most thankless of tasks. That there was such influence there can be no doubt; what this paper does is to set forth some of the parallelisms between the two religions, in order to show how much scope for influence there was, in the spheres both of belief and practice.

Macchioro, in his *From Orpheus to Paul*, suggests that Palestine at the beginning of the Christian era was an island in a surrounding sea of Orphism. Dio Chrysostom mentions the existence of Orphic beliefs at Tarsus, and other evidence for the existence of Orphic sects in Asia Minor has been found. Macchioro in general seems to be making bricks with little straw, but I think there can be little doubt that the main channel of the influence of Orphism upon Christianity at the outset was through the Essenes.

The Essenes were clearly Jews under Orphic influence; practically all the non-Judaic ideas they held, and usages they maintained, were Orphic. What especially stamps them as deriving from Orphism, I think, is their adherence to the view of the body as a prison-house for the immortal soul, a view which is of the essence of Orphism. Their eschatology, and their ab-

stinence from the slaughter of animals, are also Orphic traits. Most of the beliefs and practices which will be noticed as common to Orphism and Christianity are found among the Essenes. De Quincey's view that the Essenes were just early Christians is perhaps too simple, and there is no definite evidence for the well-known suggestion that Christ Himself was an Essene, though the fact that He makes His first adult appearance in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea, mentioned by Pliny as the *habitat* of the Essenes, is in favour of it. But apart from the plausible but negative argument that the absence of mention of the Essenes in the New Testament suggests an Essene *provenance* for the latter, there is plenty of evidence of sympathy between early Christianity and Essenism. Especial traces of this have been noticed in the Epistle of St. James; and, among other things, the emphasis on keeping 'unspotted from the world' (*Jas.* i, 27) with the saying that 'the wisdom which is from above is first *pure*' (*Jas.* iii, 17), is reminiscent of the Orphic gold plaques from Southern Italy, 'Pure come I, from the pure,' etc.

But the contact of Orphism with Christianity was not only through the Essenes. There is a well-known Orphic document, the *Testaments*, setting out monotheism. It can be shown, I think, to go back certainly to Plato, and keen-eared Germans have found echoes of it in Empedocles. One of the versions of it, quoted by Eusebius, refers to Abraham as 'the offspring of the Chaldaeans,' who is said to have been, perhaps, the only man to have seen God. Some say that the reference to Abraham is 'a Christian interpolation'; others that the *Testaments* is entirely a Christian document, being only quoted at length in Christian Fathers—a verdict which is not borne out by internal evidence or the reference in Plato. It seems to me that the document, as given by Eusebius, is both Orphic and Christian. There were people in those days who were both Orphic and Christian. The evidence for this is not so much the identification of Orpheus with Christ under the guise of the Good Shepherd in the catacombs, but the gem now in the Berlin Museum which shows Orpheus crucified, with the inscription 'Orpheos Bakkikos' (*sic*). Without the inscription the figure would undoubtedly be taken for that of Christ: it is virtually identical with a hundred representations of the Crucifixion. It seems to

be clear that, as was to be expected, the Orphics, being the most serious-minded folk in the Greek world in the matter of religion, were among the first and most ardent adherents of the new faith, and that they were not always entirely 'converted,' but fused their loyalties, which was not very difficult seeing that in several ways they had anticipated Christianity; and directly, as well as through the Essenes of Palestine, they imported ideas of their own into that new Creed.

The carver of the Berlin gem was, doubtless, expressing a truth deeper than he knew. For the striking, and as yet unrecognized, fact seems to be that the parallelism between Orphism and Christianity goes back to the careers of the founders. Seeing that Orpheus is generally supposed to be a pretty myth or a 'projection' of a sect, this may seem to be a hard saying; but though Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy in *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions* objects, truly, that Miss Harrison's statement of the historicity of Orpheus is not convincing, and Macchioro's similar statement does not seem to have found greater acceptance, nevertheless the truth is that, if the vandal mice and the Caliph Omar had destroyed our records and we lacked the mass of ancient references to the man Orpheus which we in fact possess, if only one passage were left to us, we should know that Orpheus actually lived. The passage in question does not mention Orpheus, but it is, I think, decisive. It is in the *Laws* of Plato (IV, 715 D). 'God, as the old tradition says, holding the beginning and the ending and the middle of all things, by a straight path accomplishes his end, travelling according to nature.'

Now this passage is said by the scholiast to be Orphic, and Plato commonly refers to Orphic doctrine as old tradition. Monotheism is not a doctrine of the people; primitive man finds gods in stocks and stones and 'spirits of the corn and wild,' and the average man, left to himself, believes in the mythology which so develops. To leap to the realization that God is One is an effort of religious genius. The passage in the *Laws* is evidence of religious genius in the Orphic sect, in an age which was antiquity to Plato. What further need have we of witnesses? This is, surely, the essential Orpheus, the genius at the root of the Orphic religion, as the essential Shakespeare was the man who wrote the plays, whatever his name may have been.

Orpheus, as all antiquity bears witness, was a Thracian. In Thrace he grew up as a devotee of the Dionysiac revels practised there; his great soul was rapt beyond all others in ecstasy; he felt that the Power in whose hand he was could be none other than the One Supreme Power of the world. How the mystic ecstasy engenders monotheism is explained by the account of it given by Miss Underhill in her valuable work, *Mysticism* (p. 433). 'Ecstasy is a form—the most perfect form—of the state which is technically called "complete mono-ideism."' Dean Inge says that it only occurs as a sequel to intense mental concentration. The 'One' of Plotinus is clearly the hypostasis of the oneness of the soul in apprehending it, and this is the nature of the experience. That this was the experience of Orpheus is shown by the nature of the Orphic religion, about which we have plenty of evidence; that there was some 'Damascus-road' experience in his life which caused him to abandon his previous polytheism and embrace monotheism, 'the true way,' is suggested by the account given of him by several Christian Fathers who say that this is what he did. He had a revelation, and set forth as a missionary of his new faith.

This is what Christ did: He had a revelation, and set forth as a missionary. The revelation was at His baptism. It was a mystic ecstasy; 'the heavens were opened and the spirit of God descended on Him.' That is ecstasy. He felt that His especial sonship was revealed to Him; though His actual belief in the Oneness of God was inherited by Him, as a Jew, from that other ecstasy of Moses at the Burning Bush, nevertheless there came to Him an original conviction thereof, to which He later gave utterance of His own authority, and not as the Scribes:

'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one God.'

The original mystical experience of Christ was at the Baptism. I think the walking on the water is another; it recalls the tales told of the old Greek sages, Abaris, Aristeas, etc., who are said to have done similar things, which in their case are definitely symbolic of ecstasy. The Transfiguration is clearly another mystical experience of Christ; also, I believe, the Ascension: He was received up into heaven like all the mystics in all ages.

So much for the mystical experience of Orpheus and Christ, which was the 'fountain-light of all their day.' Strabo's account

of the career of Orpheus, written before the birth of Christ, sounds strikingly like a summary of the career of the latter :

> 'Orpheus was of the tribe of the Cicones, and was a man of magical power both as regards music and divination. He went about practising orgiastic rites, and later waxing self-confident, he obtained many followers and great influence : others, suspecting that he meditated violence and conspiracy, attacked and slew him.'

Orpheus was doubtless self-confident because he believed himself to have received a revelation. Was not this the crime of Christ, in the eyes of the Jewish hierarchy, and did it not, in fact, proceed from the same kind of experience? And has not Dr. Eisler recently offered us reasons for thinking that Christ, too, was at least suspected 'of meditating violence and conspiracy'? The incident of the 'two swords' shows that His disciples at least imagined this, and the cutting off of the high priest's servant's ear shows that they themselves were not unprepared for it.

Orpheus was the reformer of an older religion, the Dionysiac, as Christ was the reformer of an older religion, the Jewish : one function of the reformer in each case was to purge and deepen the ancient religion. This is manifest when we compare Orphism with the wild Dionysiac revelling. That the early Christians recognized this spiritual quality in Orpheus is shown by their identification of him with the Good Shepherd. Finally, both reformers were put to death for their pains.

From what has been said of the careers of the founders, it will be clear that the first thing in common between Orphism and Christianity was mystical apprehension of the Oneness of God. That Orphism was a truly mystical religion is quite clear from the gold plaques which have been found in Southern Italy. It was only in the mystic ecstasy, wherein the soul grows one with the life of all things, that the worshipper could have come to feel his 'celestial lineage,' to realize himself as, in the familiar phrase, 'a son of earth and the starry heaven'; only so could the Roman lady, Caecilia Secundina, have come to speak of herself as 'having duly become a goddess.' Perhaps still clearer, as susceptible to no other explanation, is the saying current among the sect, 'There is a brightness before us, but with our eyes we see nothing'; which can refer to nothing but the white light in which God dawns on the soul.

That the ecstasy issued, as it naturally does, in the realization of the oneness of God is clear from a number of documents, quoted as 'of Orpheus,' which set forth monotheism (or pantheism, for the Greeks made no distinction, and the tendency of the ecstasy to spill over into pantheism has been troublesome in the case of Roman Catholic mystics, *e.g.* Ruysbroeck). The value of these documents has sometimes been discounted on the ground that they are quoted by Christian authors, but they are clearly referred to more than once by Plato; one version is quoted by the scholiast on the *Laws*, another by a work attributed to Aristotle, the *De Mundo*, which is at any rate pre-Christian.

Christianity was mystical from the start: it was founded on two ecstasies, that of Christ at the Baptism, and that of St. Paul on the Damascus-road. Other experiences of Christ have been mentioned, and the vision of St. Paul in the seventh heaven is familiar. The St. John who wrote the Fourth Gospel and the first Epistle, he who wrote the second and third Epistles, and John of Patmos were all obviously mystics. It is St. Paul's experience which leads to his insistence that there is 'One Lord, both of Jews and Greeks'; that of the author of the Fourth Gospel to the saying, 'This is the life eternal, to know thee the only true God'; and that of the seer of Patmos is expressed in the words 'I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending,' which remind us of Plato's 'old tradition.'

Herein, in the mystical apprehension of the Oneness of God, I do not suggest anything that can be legitimately called influence; though it is of interest to notice that St. James' phrase, 'Father of Lights, with whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning' (i, 17), has a mystical air and Orphic parallels, and that the reference to the trembling of the daimones (ii, 19), notoriously an Orphic quotation, arises out of the insistence on the Oneness of God, and that the bearing of the expression is similar in the Orphic line quoted. These, however, are matters of expression; as regards the actual experience, it is incommunicable. St. Paul's ecstasies came to him as the result of his soul's travail; but it was his preaching of them which attracted the Greeks, and particularly the Orphics. It was owing to its mystical quality that Christianity spread much faster among the Greeks than the Jews; and *per contra*, the Orphics doubtless

were particularly responsible for the development of Gnosticism within the Church.

It was as a result of their ecstasies that the Orphics had come to believe in the immortality of the soul; the S. Italian plaques, giving directions for the journeying of the soul after death, make this clear. And here I think that there is a distinct case for holding that the Christian belief came ultimately from Orphic sources. There was clearly much sympathy between the early Christians and the Essenes, for whom we have already postulated Orphic influence. Of course the Pharisees also believed in the immortality of the soul, and it has been suggested in the *Modern Churchman* that Christ may at one time have been a disciple of the Pharisees. It may here be mentioned that Jewish authorities, *e.g.* Kohler, regard the Essenes simply as a branch of the Pharisees, though the former were much more subject to non-Jewish influence. Now it occurs to me to ask whether it is more than a coincidence that the belief in the immortality of the soul in Judaea appears to date from the time of the Hellenizing Antiochus Epiphanes. It is about this time that both the Pharisees and the Essenes emerge into the light of history, and Antiochus is said to have forced Dionysiac rites on the Jews (*II Macc.* vi, 7). It may be argued that the Pharisees, as particularly patriotic Jews, would be the reverse of likely to be influenced by anything done by the arch-enemy Antiochus. To this it may be answered that the author of *II Maccabees* is particularly partisan in his statements, and it is clear from Tacitus (*Hist.* v, 5.25) that some form of Dionysiac observance took root at Jerusalem. Tacitus says that the rites he mentions could not be Dionysiac because they were not joyous, but they were doubtless the rites introduced by Antiochus performed according to the Jewish temperament. There was clearly plenty of receptivity for Hellenic ideas in Palestine in the early second century B.C., a tendency dating from the days of Alexander. Antiochus was merely tactless, like Amanullah. Orphism was a reformed and spiritualized Dionysiac worship, and it doubtless came into Palestine in Antiochus' time. The Essenes were the people most influenced by it, but the idea of the immortality of the soul percolated also to the Pharisees. The Pharisees are generally said to have inferred their belief from the martyrdoms

under Antiochus, but it seems more than possible that they were influenced in their inference by the Hellenic (*i.e.*, in this particular, Orphic) ideas that were in the air. Whether through the Pharisees or the Essenes—more probably, I imagine, the latter—the belief in the immortality of the soul seems to have come to Christianity from the Orphics.

The reason for preferring the Essenes in this connection lies in their eschatology. Dean Inge, in his latest book, states what is a commonplace among classical scholars who have paid any attention to the question, that Christian eschatology is derived from Orphic, and it would appear from Josephus' account of the eschatology of the Essenes that it was the latter who were the connecting link at the outset. It was the Orphics who, in the Greek world, originated the idea that a better life after death would be the reward of religious believers; and though Plato complains of those who degraded the idea, and sold initiation (like indulgences), holding out the prospect of 'eternal liquor,' the genuine Orphic tendency was to lay stress on good moral behaviour as the natural sequel to initiation, and to insist on such behaviour as the necessary preliminary to the beatified life after death. Pindar and Plato, giving the Orphic doctrine, say that the soul is judged after death, and Pindar pictures the good enjoying the sun day and night alike, in a habitation 'shadowed with frankincense,' or 'in meadows damascened with roses.' Pindar says that those who in three incarnations have kept their soul utterly free from evil reach the isles of the blessed. Josephus says that the Essenes held that the good went to the isles of the blessed. This doctrine is quite different from that found in Homer, where the isles of the blessed are reserved for a few favoured heroes.

The first version given of the fate of the wicked and uninitiate is that they lie in mud in the underworld. They are also said by Plato to be tortured by wild men of fiery aspect, who are clearly the precursors of the devils of hell. It is notable that the only place in the Old Testament where any after-life for the wicked is spoken of is in *Daniel* (xii, 2), *i.e.* after Antiochus Epiphanes; and the general idea of the after-life, if any, in the Old Testament is extremely vague. The Essenes believed that torment in wintry night would befall the wicked. It is clear that

the Christian ideas of heaven and hell are much closer to those of the Orphics than to anything found in the Old Testament, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that they came partly from the Essenes and still more from Orphic converts to Christianity.

The Orphics were notoriously ascetics. They were in particular vegetarians, avoiding the slaughter of animals because of the reverence for life which their mystic experience gave them. There is some evidence for their fasting with a view to their ecstasies. That there was also an element of sexual asceticism in the Orphic life is, I think, suggested by the different stories which agree on the point that Orpheus had a lot of trouble with the Thracian women; while Orphics admitted women as members, as is clear from the case of Caecilia Secundina, they laid great stress on purity of life. The Essenes abstained from bodily sacrifices, and most of them from marriage. It is clear from the Pauline epistles that these tendencies were prevalent in the early Church. In the matter of asceticism it is difficult to be dogmatic on the question of influence; the same reasons that produced asceticism among the Orphics may have produced it among the early Christians. On the other hand, the number of points of correspondence between early Christianity and Essenism (which had the highest code of kindness and morality) is striking. Essenism itself has all the air of an eclectic, unoriginal system; and where we find Christianity agreeing with it, it almost looks as if Christianity were the borrower from the earlier system, and therefore indebted ultimately to the source of the particular element in Essenism.

BOOK REVIEWS

AN ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY*

Ely has been fortunate in her historians; she had Bentham in 1771 and Stewart in 1868, and now Mr. Atkinson comes with perhaps the most exhaustive monograph ever written on any English monastery buildings, splendidly produced by the Cambridge University Press. The author, who for many years held the post of diocesan architect, had had the amplest opportunities of observation, and the work is evidently a labour of love. His conclusions are not less valuable for his frank admissions here and there that, after all possible search and discussion, we cannot yet boast of

* *An Architectural History of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Etheldreda at Ely.* By Thomas Dinham Atkinson. (Cambridge University Press, 1933. £5/5/0 net.)

certainty. For readers of the *Modern Churchman* it will be best to attempt a review which, though naturally more interesting to those who have visited this beautiful site and lingered about the grounds, may have value also for all who care to know what a cathedral monastery was like in the Middle Ages.

He writes in his Preface (p. xxxii):

'The essentials of the monastic plan in England were almost wholly the result of tradition, and were modified in only a very slight degree by evolution. It was a plan largely imported from a sunny clime where it had been developed by a race of different temperament from ourselves, and it underwent very little change. And even where it was the result of home conditions, was it wholly good?

'It was only after much quarrelling that the practice of having two churches under one roof, with two services going on at the same time, was in some instances ended; while in others it persisted to the last. The utmost that could be done with the cold cloister was to rebuild the open arches as windows and to glaze them, and then to fit up the place with carrels. And after all, the result was the frequent illicit resort to the comfort of the Common House with its fire, and the creation of many private chambers. Again, a place which was to be at once a study for reading and meditation, a library for the preservation, composition and copying of books, a schoolroom for teaching novices, and a corridor or passage between the most important parts of the monastery, could hardly have answered all these requirements very satisfactorily. Nor was the placing of the guest houses altogether convenient. The ideal plan of S. Gall, diagrammatic in form but practical and sensible in many of its arrangements, has the guest house and the school and the hostel for visiting monks on the side of the church away from the rest of the monastery, and the novices are given a separate cloister of their own. But in English houses this was not done,[1] and the intrusion of strangers, including women, into the cloister in order to reach the church or for other purposes, became a practical difficulty. Monastic arrangement indeed illustrates in a striking way the medieval difficulty in breaking away from tradition. Thus it was more easy to obtain an indulgence for eating meat than to break down the tradition that it must not be eaten in the frater; consequently the brethren habitually eat in another place and the frater was deserted. The division of the business of the house, to take an example from outside the province of architecture, among many independent departments ["obediences"], led to quite a sixth or a quarter of the number of brethren, or sometimes even half of them, being partly or wholly withdrawn from the cloister, so that the remainder came to be called "cloister monks." The obedientiaries absented themselves even from services in the church, to which they sent vicars to represent them, because they were too busy with secular affairs. Although these methods may have given fresh vitality to the monastic life by affording to its more active or capable members some outlet for their energies (as well as some luxuries), it may fairly be asked whether apart from other considerations they were the best even from the business point of view. In any case the question is allowable here because the system certainly reacted on the buildings. But after all it may well be urged that the system and the plan had grown up gradually, that in a rough and ready way

[1] Indeed, the general belief now is that it was never done even at St. Gall, and that the famous plan of that abbey was imaginary: the sort of thing that might be done if one started with a clean slate and ample funds.—G.G.C.

they met the needs of the time, that we of to-day are perhaps equally the slaves of custom and that, whether or no, it is not for us to criticize buildings so beautiful and so full at once of religious feeling and of human interest.'

Montalembert, in that famous *Monks of the West,* which has coloured deeply all modern monastic historians, and sometimes most deeply those who have least plainly confessed their debt to the book, gives a high testimonial to English conservatism in architecture; he points out in his Preface how we, and the Germans, have kept a few medieval monasteries in a more perfect state than any in his own France. After all that can be said against the vandalism of Henry VIII and the Puritans, the abbeys of the Continent have suffered even worse than ours: 'It has been calculated' (writes Montalembert) 'that in our lifetime, within the five years from 1830 to 1835, three thousand monasteries had disappeared from the soil of Europe.' For generations before that, the monks themselves had been pulling down the old work and rebuilding it in the taste of the day wherever they could afford to spend the money. Meanwhile, with us, the original buildings were largely spared, thanks to the system by which eight cathedral chapters had been monasticized in the Middle Ages; so that the continuance of the episcopal order did much to protect the conventional buildings. Among these, Ely stands out as particularly fortunate. We cannot do better than to let Mr. Atkinson speak here again (p. xix):

> 'Not a few religious houses show a more complete plan on paper than Ely, but probably none makes so near an approach to a monastery in working order. While those are represented in many cases by walls now but a few inches high, at Ely with few exceptions every building shown on the plan is an occupied house, its principal rooms covered by a medieval roof, its menial offices or what were formerly such ceiled with a medieval vault.'

Let us, then, look back to this 'monastery in working order.'

Few visitors to our cathedrals or to our show ruins realize how few in number were the monks who worshipped in these enormous churches, who inhabited this large group of buildings, and who acted as trustees for such abundant revenues. At Ely, as in a good many cathedral or other monasteries, the nave of the great church was used for worship by the parishioners: the monks had their choir under the lantern, their high-altar to the east of this, and the other altars in the different chapels around. These monks are numbered once, about 1090 A.D., at seventy-two, possibly with a little exaggeration. When, in 1109, the cathedral see was constituted and a considerable proportion of the monastic revenues were earmarked for the bishop, the monks complained that he had scarcely left enough for the livelihood of forty monks, 'instead of the seventy whom we had aforetime.' Just before the Black Death there were fifty-three; three or four years later, only thirty-five; they never again seem to have reached sixty. 'Seven years before the Dissolution there were thirty-seven monks, and at the time of the surrender twenty-four.' These numbers were lords of an enclosure of some forty acres (admirably reproduced here by the aerophoto of the whole town) and of a collection of buildings which in itself formed a small town, inhabited probably by something like a hundred servants of different sorts.

> 'There were, I think, six chapels outside the great church besides the Lady Chapel and the parish church of the Holy Trinity and the chapel of St. Catherine against the south transept. There were prob-

ably ten or a dozen halls of one sort and another and about as many kitchens. Besides these there were several lesser establishments which probably obtained as time went on a degree of independence: such as those of the schoolmaster, living between the cloister and the Infirmary, the chapel keepers between the Lady Chapel and the presbytery and some men, also guardians, living in the east triforium of the south transept. Each of these departments had its own endowments and managed its own finances; each had therefore some sort of office large or small according to circumstances, with a clerk or clerks, keeping accounts and paying out large or small amounts in hard cash or in robes, for work done or for materials supplied or to secure the recipients' good will. Some account of the fifteen officers or obedientiaries has been already given; as they all present annual accounts there must have been some such number of rooms in different parts of the monastery set apart for accountancy work, and it is disappointing not to have been able to identify a large number of these checkers.'

Ely was distinguished also, as Canterbury was, by the number of gardens kept within the precincts by the different monastic officers, or 'obedientiaries.' 'We are told a good deal about the bishop's vineyard [in the different account-rolls, of which many survive from the Middle Ages]; and Ely long continued famous for its grapes.' Mr. Atkinson does not, however, quote the most definite medieval testimonial, from the verses prefixed to the anonymous *Chronicle of Ely:* 'These are [the glories] of Ely: the Lantern, the Lady-Chapel, the Mill and the vineyard which produces much wine.'

The story of Alan de Walsingham, to whose energy and business ability we owe the famous Lantern, comes out in these pages with all the emphasis it deserves, and without the now discredited exaggerations which would make him 'architect,' in the strict modern artistic sense, of that wonderful structure. To Prior Cranden, again, the author does full justice, and to the extraordinarily beautiful little chapel which he built. He is misleading, however, probably only for want of clear expression, in that particular note (p. 87), where he tells us 'I have found no definite record of a visit by Queen Philippa.' The visit is explicitly mentioned by the chronicler (*Anglia Saera,* Vol. I, p. 650), and it was probably on this occasion that she made the splendid gift which Mr. Atkinson records: 'This royal lady gave a certain precious robe with all its garnitures, of murrey velvet powdered with golden squirrels, which she had worn at her purification after the birth of her firstborn, the most excellent Lord Edward (the Island Prince).'

Cranden's and Walsingham's buildings, with all the rest, come out in every detail in the ample separate portfolio of plates with which the volume is accompanied, elaborately tinted to show every stage in the chronological development of the monastery. Most illuminating, again, are the sketch-plans on pp. xxvii and xxxi, showing the buildings and the precincts of eight great monasteries in relation to their towns—Winchester, Worcester, St. Alban's, Bury, Chester, Norwich, Canterbury and Durham. Nor must the map of the Fenland be forgotten, with all its monastic houses, great and small, which does so much to make the economic history of Ely intelligible. Finally, the photographic illustrations are very beautiful.

Though Mr. Atkinson's task is mainly architectural, he has gleaned from Bentham and Stewart and other sources a number of indications very valuable for social history. We see how, in the tower which still stands almost unaltered on the sheer side of the monastery, a family of official goldsmiths lived from generation to generation. These were not monks but

laymen — though the monk-goldsmith and the monk-illuminator were the least exceptional of monastic artists in the Middle Ages, yet even these were far outnumbered by the lay artists, as monastic records themselves show. The first of this Ely family had 'learned his craft from Ankebil, the "inconquerable" goldsmith of St. Alban's, early in the twelfth century.' His name was Saleman; he was probably a converted Jew, and ancestor to John Saleman, who became prior in 1291 and finally Bishop of Norwich. Again, we learn that the almonry school, the only one (except doubtless a small choir-school), which did anything for outside boys, contained five scholars only; the master was also a chaplain, under statutory obligation to sing Mass six days in the week. In this and many similar ways the present volume helps to a better understanding of the real services of the monks. They were, on the whole, good employees, while doing little themselves beyond choir-services and business management. (I speak here of the mass of them, apart from abbots and priors, who sometimes did political work.) They were trustees for an amount of poor-relief which was sensibly missed at the Dissolution; yet, from that point of view, the working expenses of medieval relief were enormous. Mr. Atkinson's book, like others which are now being written from the actual records, enables us to visualize a community of great dignity but of increasing conservatism. This need not embitter our feelings with regard to these remains which appeal so strongly to our antiquarian and artistic senses; yet it goes far to reconcile us to the changes which have transferred the medieval buildings to other possessors.

G. G. COULTON.

SACRIFICE*

Ideas about sacrifice have become as confused as ideas about salvation for the simple reason that the terms have changed their meaning. Speaking of sacrifice, the author of the latest book on the subject* says that 'in the anthropological treatment of a ritual of this character which has persisted throughout the ages, and undergone a complete metamorphosis in the long course of its complex history, there is a danger of interpreting the final products in terms of crude beginnings by the simple method of overleaping the intervening series of changes in thought and expression.' To avoid this danger, Dr. James has sought to carry his investigation through its successive stages to the higher ethical manifestations of the ritual with a view to discovering the fundamental principles inherent in the institution as a whole and to determining the chief phases of its expression. In the course of his investigation he discusses the blood-offering, vegetation ritual, human sacrifice, head-hunting and cannibalism, mystery cults, sacrament and sacrifice in Christianity, propitiation and atonement, priesthood and the altar, and the institution of sacrifice.

An analysis of the ritual of the blood-offering takes us back, we are told, in its rudimentary modes of expression to an early stage in the food quest long before the institution of sacrifice as a culture pattern emerged. 'From time immemorial blood has been regarded as the restorer of life to the dead, the bestower of health and strength to the living, and the sacred bond uniting those who possessed a common soul-substance. It is this cycle of ideas which appears to lie behind the Palaeolithic hunting ritual, and constitutes the fundamental concept in the blood-offering in higher states of culture.'

* *Origins of Sacrifice: A Study in Comparative Religion.* By E. O. James (John Murray, 1933. 10/6 net).

A similar cycle of ideas underlies the sacrificial ritual which seeks to control the processes of vegetation. 'Any object especially charged with vitality, such as female figurines, new fruits, or water, may fulfil the same function as that exercised by blood in hunting magic and its subsequent developments. When this system of offerings is brought into relation with the death and resurrection drama, it assumes a mystery significance as part of the culture pattern centring in the divine kingship and its relations to the natural order, out of which the institution of sacrifice emerged, with its many strands in an ancient past. Thus, it was around the practice of slaying the divine king that the Tammuz rites appear to have developed, and it has been suggested that Osiris perished in the Nile flood.' Human sacrifice seen in this light acquires a new meaning. In so far as it was a product of agricultural society, it was directed in the first instance to the growth of the crops and the maintenance of the sequence of vegetation. 'The efficacy of blood in general as a life-giving agent would naturally invest human blood with a unique significance as the vital essence of the highest organism in creation. Moreover, when it was supposed that the king was himself divine and endowed with supernatural powers upon which the welfare of the community and the natural order depended, the royal life stood at a premium. This involved the sacrifice of the king in order that his vitality might be transferred to a vigorous successor before it diminished. As solar ideas developed, and commoners came to take the place of the sovereign at the altar, human sacrifice occupied a conspicuous place in the calendrical ritual, which tended, as among the Aztecs, to promote a perpetual state of warfare to maintain the enormous demand for human hearts.'

It has been contended by Dr. W. J. Perry that the origin of warfare is to be found to a large extent in the practice of head-hunting. In any case, heads, like hearts, were in demand, not for the sake of satisfying a brutal instinct, but in order, by their richness in soul-substance, to make the soil productive. This is true also to a large extent of cannibalism. 'Cannibalism on the whole is probably a less organized institution than human sacrifice, but where it is not the result of necessity for the satisfaction of hunger the fundamental ritual motive is similar, inasmuch as both rites are so intimately connected with the giving and receiving of soul-substance.'

Coming to the Mystery Cults, Dr. James explains that, speaking generally, the way of salvation revealed in the Mysteries was the communication to the votary of the life-giving powers of the divine hero through certain asceticisms, tests, rites and sacerdotal directions implicitly followed, in order to establish a vital union between the divinity and his devotees. The philosophers provide eternal hopes and aspirations, but the ordinary man is incapable of philosophical reasoning. What made the cults so popular was the promise they gave to him of an assured hereafter in return for the simple expedient of following the prescribed ritual. 'The Mystery way of communion in many respects was thus more closely allied to the magical control of supernatural powers than to a religious mystic union with a divine personality, though in the death and resurrection drama a real fellowship of suffering seems to have been achieved. By dying in order to be reborn to a new life the votaries became identified with the mystery deity in an intimate and ecstatic communion. However crude some of the more orgiastic rites may have been, the scheme of redemption offered by the Cults was essentially of a sacramental character in the general sense applicable to a covenant relationship between a deity and his worshippers. But when we pass from the general to the particular the evidence fails us.' Dr. James thinks it is very difficult to say how far, if at all, any real similarity existed,

for example, between the mystery meals and lustrations and the Eucharist and baptismal rites of the Christian Church, since the only available comparative material comes from the second century of our era and onwards. He agrees, however, that 'the Mystery Religions may be described as sacramental dramas which were destined to play a significant part in preparing the way for the establishment of a Christian sacramentalism in Europe.'

Dr. James' book is in several ways remarkable and deserves to be widely studied.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

SIGNS AND INSTRUMENTS*

In his Preface, Canon Quick tells us this little book is based on a course of lectures delivered to the clergy at St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, and his principal aim 'has been to approach certain matters of theological and ecclesiastical controversy from as great a distance as possible and not to get too close to them in the end.'

He opens on a philosophical note by distinguishing between signs (or symbols) and instruments, and this distinction runs through most of the book, often illuminating but sometimes obscuring the issues. In the second chapter this distinction is applied to the contrast between Hebraism and Hellenism, and the argument concludes with the thought that the Christian Gospel is Hebraic, the gospel of a divine act. This leads on to a chapter showing 'how in the New Testament the wine of the Christian revelation begins to burst the bottles of Judaism': this development is traced in the thought of St. Paul and St. John. After contrasting the thought of these two Apostles, we come nearer to modern controversies with a chapter on Christology. Canon Quick first discusses the idea of the divine action in the Incarnation—'this essential idea of the very Godhead operative and manifest in the flesh of Jesus Christ.' In contrast to this 'instrumental' aspect of the Incarnation, he puts the 'symbolic value,' and sees in Canon Streeter's *Reality* an 'extreme and exclusive emphasis on symbolism.' He suggests that it is in reaction from such 'Christology of modern humanitarianism' that we have the Barthian Christology, supported by form-criticism. However, in the end, our writer remains dissatisfied with the thought of the Incarnate life merely as symbol and with the thought of it merely as divine act breaking in from above. Thus, though we see the wood, we do not get out of it. It is a pity there is no discussion in this book of Dr. Raven's suggestions in *Jesus and the Gospel of Love,* for there, too, the wood is seen, and Dr. Raven makes an attempt to get out of it by considering afresh the nature of personal life. The last chapter of Canon Quick's book is on 'The Church and the Sacraments'; in it he says wise words about seeing the Church's rules in relation to the Church's purpose—the redemption of society. He goes on to discuss the attitude to the sacraments of the Catholic wing of the Anglican Church and suggests the trend has been away from instrumentalism to symbolism—hence, in practice, the interest in 'devotions.' For himself he hesitates. It is to the element in Catholic doctrine represented by the *opus operatum* to which he chiefly clings. This brief account of his book by no means does justice to the number of interesting points Canon Quick makes in the course of it.

One cannot help wishing Canon Quick had dealt more fully with 'The Gospel of Divine Action,' for it is a subject of great importance. Like

* *The Gospel of Divine Action.* By the Rev. Canon O. C. Quick, D.D. (Nisbet, 1933. 5/-).

others on the Catholic wing, when he thinks of divine action, he seems to concentrate on the divine action in the Incarnation and the Sacraments. This leads him apparently to overlook how greatly Dr. Streeter, whom he criticises, is concerned with the divine action of God's creative love in the lives of men to-day. It is religious concern and not, as Canon Quick seems to think, some vague philosophic interest which makes some of us a little shy of his concentration. H. G. MULLINER.

ISLAM IN FAITH AND PRACTICE*

There was a time when the missionary was so concerned with the truth of his own message that he never troubled to ask whether there might be any particle of truth in the beliefs of a different faith. Thus when Pizarro began his mission in Peruvia, his attitude was well summed up in his words to the Inca chief, 'You worship false gods: you will be burned in the eternal fire of hell . . . therefore adore the only God and accept the Holy Catholic Faith.' But the comparative study of religion has changed all this. The missionary of to-day may be equally sure of his faith, but, realising that every religion may have its real contribution to make to the truth, he attempts to build on this fact rather than to ignore it. This attitude characterizes the recent study of Mohammedanism by Mr. Bevan Jones. It is a constructive criticism of the Muslim faith and of our Christian witness to it.

Mr. Bevan Jones is well qualified for this study. He has been Principal of the Henry Martyn School of Islamics in Lahore, and during his twenty years in India he has specialized in work among the Muslims. Hence this account of Islam is a scholarly piece of work showing a thorough acquaintance with Muslim history and literature and an appreciation of Muslim modernist apologetic. It covers a very wide field of history and so can only be called an outline. Its rather didactic style and its tendency to repetition is due to the fact that it was planned as a text-book for Indian clergy and teachers.

It is divided into five parts. The first deals with the rise and expansion of Islam and shows how its rapid advance came as a war of political conquest rather than as a religious crusade; the latter followed later when none but Muslims were allowed to remain in conquered territory. The next section deals with the foundations of Islam, and the writer traces the development of its structure through Tradition and Canon Law, a development with a familiar ring. An error of date on page 92 makes Muslim 'interpretations' begin before Muhammad himself. The section on the Faith and Practice of Islam is of necessity very involved, but it has a wealth of information in it. In particular, the chapter on the Creed is a good study of the fatalism of Mohammedanism, and of its effects upon conduct. The next section brings the history of Islam up to modern times and outlines its modernist apologetic, while the concluding section faces up to this new Mohammedanism and contains an excellent survey of the sources of strength in Islam as well as of its inadequacy. The earnestness and humility which underlie the chapter 'A Candid Enquiry into our Methods' make stimulating missionary reading, and give perhaps more point than the writer intended to his words, 'Where in the wide world is the Muslim who despises a really Christ-like man or woman?' We commend this book as an important contribution to our knowledge of Mohammedanism.

J. P. HODGES.

* *The People of the Mosque.* By L. Bevan Jones, B.A., B.D. (S.C.M. Price 10/6).

CORRESPONDENCE

VON HÜGEL AND THE GROUPS.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

I read the Rev. Geoffrey Allen's *He that Cometh.* Then I read, perhaps for the seventh or eighth time, parts of Baron von Hügel's *Selected Letters.* How does the second book stand to the first? What would von Hügel think of the Group Movement? It is a question, if I may say so, of considerable interest. On the one hand is an illustrious Christian philosopher, a potent spiritual force in the thoughtful England of our day, held in utmost reverence by those who had the honour to know him; on the other hand is a Revival Movement, active, spreading, full of hope, which believes that it is being guided to bring repentance and new life to the sick Churches. How would von Hügel regard it? How would he regard it as portrayed, with superb sincerity, by Mr. Allen?

I can give only a personal impression. Generally, no doubt, von Hügel was averse to what he would deem irregular religious associations; he feared in them 'excitement' which is effervescent and weak, as contrasted with 'zest' which is steady and durable. He agreed with a friend that '"side-shows," *queer* things religiously — all that is not central, sober, balanced, may indeed help certain souls in certain ways, but that for ourselves we should certainly eschew being drawn into attending them' (*Letters,* p. 309). Notwithstanding, von Hügel's sympathies were so wide —*e.g.* 'If I get among a lot of jolly, middle-class Nonconformists I feel at home' (*Letters,* p. 64) — and his eye for religious sincerity was so quick that, could he study the Group Movement at first hand, I believe he would hold it in genuine respect. It claims to be largely free from excitement; but what would attract von Hügel, once for all, is the *spiritual reality* of the Movement. It is what has attracted a good many of us, particularly when we have looked inside. You go to a Group Meeting — the reality of the thing is unmistakable. These people are absorbed in the purpose; they are intent; you see it in their faces; they are out to track sin in their own lives to its lair — after years, perhaps, of half-measures and self-deception to face at last the lie in the soul and be rid of it; nothing else matters; differences of class, of age, of education, of denomination are forgotten; and the fellowship is unspoken and delightful. I do not say that every member of a meeting finds in it these treasures, but I fancy that many do find them or something like them. Loving the Church of England with a lifelong love, ineradicable, I confess with a pang that I have not found anything approaching such a spirituality and fellowship in any official Church gathering — ruridecanal, diocesan, devotional — which during many years I have ever attended. The note of the ecclesiastical meetings was propriety; the note of the Group meetings was power.

Of course, the Movement has its dangers and, I think, its defects. For instance, there seems to be in some Groupists a certain exclusiveness; they seem to ignore the profuse variety of spiritual experience among Christians, and to depreciate the lower stages of spiritual growth. Von Hügel would disapprove this temper. 'If God, if Christ, loves men — and who can doubt it? — He loves the *average* very much, the poor little virtue, the poor little insight. How splendidly Fénelon feels [in one of his correspondents] a certain unchristian aristocraticalness of mind' (*Selected Letters,* p. 315).

Again, a frequent charge against the Groups is that they are indifferent to the Church and Sacraments. Von Hügel, a prophet of the 'Institutional Element' in religion, would, as we have already seen, regret this. But probably the criticism is exaggerated. Some Group leaders seem at times, indeed, to invite it. But other Group leaders speak in an opposite sense. For example, Dr. Edgar Brookes, Professor of Political Science, Transvaal University College, Pretoria, writes: 'The Oxford Group Movement has brought to me a new conversion, and a new dedication. That is not in any way to repudiate my past religious experience, or the debt of gratitude that I owe to . . . the organised Church . . . In the Group Movement we find enthusiasm without schism' (*The Letter,* No. 7, published by the Groups, pp. 5, 61). So, on the Church side, an Anglican Sister, of the Community of the Resurrection, Grahamstown, though not perhaps definitely a Groupist, writes with fervent and personal gratitude of the Group Team and their work in S. Africa (*The Letter,* No. 7, pp. 22-24).

The Groups, no doubt, have much to learn. So has the Church — both, not without suffering and sacrifice. The dream for some of us would be that the Groups by association with the Church should acquire order, stability, freedom from excitement, if it be there, with its transitoriness; and that the Church by welcoming the Groups should be awakened to the fact which, if we go deep enough, is most full of pathos and disquietude in England to-day — the Church's own need of repentance and new life.

HUBERT HANDLEY.

40 Woodstock Avenue,
Golders Green, N.W.11.

MODERNISM AND ITS FUTURE.

SIR,

In a timely paper on the above subject in the March issue, Mr. Darby has called attention to the future of our advancing and conquering Modernism. It is opportune that the ultimate effect upon the Church and the world should not be lost to view. Whither are we tending? What next? are burning questions. Mr. Darby says rightly, 'The Church is still in the making and must live in the hope that the kingdom of this world will become the Kingdom of God and of His Christ,' and he concludes the article, 'The work before Modernism is to bring back the realization of the Kingship of Jesus Christ and to make Him the rallying-point for all humanity, and in order to do this it must emphasize what He actually revealed.'

It is now generally admitted by students that modern critical scholarship has shaken the foundation upon which fundamental Catholicism and Protestantism have alike been reared, *viz.* the verbally inspired Book and the verbally inspired Church, whether the Book rests on the authority of the Church, or the Church on the authority of the Book. And this accounts for the losing hold of Institutional Religion, of whatever brand, on the faith of intelligent Christian people, who are everywhere wandering from its shaky shelters, as especially the young, gathering in the Oxford Groups. It is here surely that Modernism comes forward to succour the fallen, and to give a positive lead, when perhaps its negative criticism is done for the time being. And what is the faith that will not fail — the inspiration that will avail for the future? It has been felt at Modernist Conferences and meetings that this practical want has not been sufficiently considered. Modernist speakers have helped us so far, but dare they not yet go farther?

It is tentatively asked: 'Is the day of Institutional Religion passing, in order that the fuller revelation — the day of the Lord, may dawn?' In the dark days of our world troubles, dare we look up as the day of our Redemption draweth nigh? Is 'the world grey with morning light?' Is not the hour dawning, which Our Lord foretold, when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem are we to worship the Father, where the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth? Can we not catch the distant voice out of heaven saying 'Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them and they shall be His people and God Himself shall be with them and be their God?'

It is remarkable that S. Peter, upon whom the Church was to be built, and who has been all along claimed as its Greatest Apostle and Founder, used the Keys entrusted to him, in his first recorded utterance after Pentecost, not to outline or visualize a mighty all-powerful Ecclesiastical Organization, which did arise; but to unlock the ancient prophecy of God: 'It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh, and it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' Can we take courage that though our churches are not filling and our ancient Creeds not accepted, these prophetic utterances herald the approach of the larger Faith in Christ, at the critical time we have entered, at the closing of the old Dispensation — the End of the World — clearly marked by the overthrow of the old order by World War. The prophecies envisage the new era, not of ecclesiastical reunion and dominance, but of the world-wide outpouring of the Spirit of God, not any longer confined within the boundaries of any church or organization. Max Müller commenting on S. Augustine, wrote of these days: 'Surely man will never rest until he has discovered the purpose that runs through the religions of mankind, till he has reconstructed the true Civitas Dei, on foundations as wide as the ends of the world.' Are we then as Modernists to pray for and expect the triumph of the Church over the world as the end in view and the Reunion of Christendom to take place in the establishment of ecclesiastical supremacy at Rome or elsewhere as the Catholics, Roman and Anglican, do; or can we believe that the world is to become so Christian in spirit as not to need the ecclesiastical organization to keep it alive any longer?

In other words, are we to look for the ultimate triumph of Christianity in the coming of a *Church World*, where Church organization dominates the world; or a *World Church*, where the whole world has become so under the influence of Christ that the Church which helped to bring it about is no longer a 'necessary evil'? This raises a very large question, affecting the whole present outlook, which at all events is worthy of our earnest thought, though impossible here to discuss further, but I can sum up in the familiar words of Dean Inge in his Christian Ethics and Modern Problems (p. 156), which emphasize the point of Modernism and its future. 'The more the Gospel leavens society, the less perhaps will the power of the Church become, and the less need will be felt for a large Christian Ministry. Is this a prospect we ought to deplore? Not at all. The one object of a good educator is to make himself unnecessary.'

H. J. PALMER,
Canon Emeritus of Ripon.

Worthing.
May 1st, 1933.